EX
LIBRIS
SAINT
JOSEPH'S
COLLEGE
EAST CHICAGO
INDIANA

GIFT OF ALBERT KAISER

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/mysticrosestudyo0001erne

THE MYSTIC ROSE

THE MYSTIC ROSE

A STUDY OF PRIMITIVE MARRIAGE AND OF PRIMITIVE THOUGHT IN ITS BEARING ON MARRIAGE

BY

ERNEST CRAWLEY

A NEW EDITION
REVISED AND GREATLY ENLARGED BY
THEODORE BESTERMAN

IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I

τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν
Sacramentum hoc magnum est

BONI AND LIVERIGHT
PUBLISHERS NEW YORK
1927

GN
480
.C8
1927
Vol.1

SECOND REVISED EDITION

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

TO

SIR J. G. FRAZER, O.M.

IN

GRATITUDE AND ADMIRATION

EDITOR'S PREFACE

Though this book had been out of print for a number of years and obtainable in the sale-room only at a high premium, other preoccupations for long prevented Mr Crawley from preparing a new edition. But, his work having in the course of time gained a very high degree of estimation, having, indeed, become one of the very few classics of anthropology and of primitive psychology, Mr Crawley was at last persuaded, two years ago, to undertake the necessary work. Immediately upon this decision followed his sudden death, in the prime of his life and of his intellectual power.

The interval had been too short to allow Mr Crawley any opportunity to determine the scope of his proposed revision, or even to make any notes, nor had I the means, not having had the privilege of his personal acquaintance, to ascertain the trend of his views during recent years. Thus, when I was invited to undertake this edition, I did not feel authorised to attempt any amendment of the theories herein expressed, and I have restricted my interference with the text to the extent about to be indicated.

I have verified (few corrections were necessary) and reduced to order the references to authorities, striking

out, together with the appropriate matter in the text, nearly all those taken at second-hand from such works as those of Featherman, Waitz-Gerland and Ploss-Bartels. Where I have been able, in a few instances, to trace such references to their sources, I have placed the new references within square brackets. A few paragraphs have been transposed, and in several cases the evidence has been re-arranged into geographical sequences. The only other amendments of the text are the occasional verbal alterations involved by the addition of evidence and of arguments. The chief of these additions are shown in the Table following this Preface (the asterisks indicating extracts from Mr Crawley's scattered writings) and will be seen to consist, first, of evidence, or further evidence, where the argument seemed to require strengthening, and of specimens of the large accumulations of anthropological material during the last two decades, and, secondly, of replies to criticisms and of discussions of the more recently advanced theories. All the additions are enclosed in square brackets, and the extracts above-mentioned are further shown by inverted commas. To these revisions affecting the text I have added a Bibliography and a new and more comprehensive Index, the latter being supplemented by a considerable number of cross-references in the footnotes.

Having thus at least avoided the mutilation of his work, I trust that its new form will not be found to do an injustice to the memory of a brilliant and original scholar and writer.

I have to thank Messrs T. & T. Clark and the executors of Dr Hastings for permission to quote from

some of Mr Crawley's numerous and valuable articles in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, and the Clarendon Press for similar permission in respect of Mr Crawley's paper in *Anthropological Essays presented to Edward Burnett Tylor*.

TH. B.

September, 1926

TABLE OF THE CHIEF ADDITIONS TO THE FIRST EDITION.

First Edition	Second Edition	Chief Additions.
Page(s)	*Page(s)* *vol. i*	
22-26	22-30	Further evidence of the savage's fear of the new, *etc.*
26	32-33	* Note on the abnormality in primitive thought of death and disease.
26-28	33-37	Further evidence of this belief.
49	61	Criticism of "functional psychology" anthropology.
49-50	62-65	Further evidence of the occupational separation of the sexes.
50-51	65-71	Further evidence of sexual separation before war, *etc.*
46-48	77-83	Further evidence of the influence of sexual taboo on language.
78	109	Criticism of Dr Freud's theory regarding the origin of taboo.
187	224-226	Reply to M. Reinach's criticism of the author's theory concerning the transmission of sexual characteristics.
204	242-244	Evidence of male dress worn by women of masculine temperament.
205	246-248	Evidence of the timidity of savage women.
206	248-249	Reply to Dr Marett's criticism of the author's theory concerning the male savage's fear of the transmission of female characteristics.
212	257*n.*	Reply to M. Durkheim's criticism of the author's theory concerning the part played by blood in primitive thought.
219	265	Evidence of special sleeping-places for young men.
270	320-323	Evidence of boys disguised as girls, *etc.*
282	338-359	* Discussion of the nature and history of the kiss.
289	366-371 *vol.* ii.	* Discussion of the nature and early history of the dance.
304	13-15	Francis Parkman on the guardian spirits of the American Indians.
341	56-57	Discussion, and further evidence, of marriage to trees, *etc.*
344	61-62	Discussion of various theories concerning the deferment of consummation after marriage.
349	70-76	Discussion of Dr Freud's views concerning defloration artificially or by proxy.
364	91-92	Further evidence of the capture of the bride from the female sex.
371	101-115	* Survey of the exchange and inversion of dress.
378-379	124-128	Further evidence of eating together at marriage and betrothal.
387	137-138	Note on the exchange of gifts at marriage and betrothal.
388	139-140	Criticism of the view of bridal gifts as a form of compensation.
408	162-168	Reply to Dr Westermarck's criticism of the author's theory of separation between males and females related by marriage, with tables analysing such separations.
450	212-220	* Historical reconstruction of the origin of exogamy.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THE present theory was outlined about seven years ago, and a preliminary portion was published in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* for 1895 (vol. xxiv.). In that paper the main lines of the argument were laid down, and it was suggested that the explanation of marriage ceremonies and systems was to be developed thereon. The subsequent loss of a good deal of my materials, not yet all recovered, has been balanced by the publication of Messrs Spencer and Gillen's valuable researches amongst the Central Australian natives, which confirm my conclusions in many ways.

These conclusions were originally completed without reference to the prevalent doctrines, originated by Bachofen and McLennan, and developed by Morgan, Bastian, Lubbock, G. A. Wilken, Robertson Smith, Giraud-Teulon, Fison, Howitt, Tylor, Post, Lippert, and others, concerning the origin and development of marriage, such as the Matriarchate (Bachofen), Marriage by Capture (McLennan), Primitive Promiscuity and Communal Marriage, comprising the hypotheses that some marriage ceremonies are intended to make the husband and wife of the same tribal or blood-kinship, and that others are "expiation for

marriage" (Sir J. Lubbock); that is to say, these ceremonies are a compensation to the tribe or kin, individual marriage being an infringement of communal rights. These theories had to be taken into consideration. Previous study of the psychology of the lower races, starting from Professor Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, and Dr Frazer's *Golden Bough*, to both of which I owe a great intellectual debt, made it evident that these prevalent theories of marriage origins were based on an imperfect understanding of primitive custom and thought. It also appeared a mistake, in view of the undifferentiated character of early thought, to separate the study of marriage systems and marriage ceremonies. I have here attempted to supply a more adequate basis for the enquiry by an analysis of the simplest and most elemental aspects in which the individual appears in relation to society. The ultimate appeal in these questions is to universal facts of human physiology and psychology. In illustration, it is perhaps worth mentioning that I was led from a general study of primitive culture to the study of marriage, by an investigation into the curious custom of exchange of dress between men and women, which occurs in the most dissimilar connections and the strangest places. I found that all cases of the custom yielded on analysis the same psychological components as to the relations of the sexes generally, and marriage in particular.

In 1889 Professor E. B. Tylor first applied statistics to the study of these questions (*Journ. Anthrop. Inst.*, vol. xviii.). This was an important departure. It is first necessary, however, thoroughly to analyse every custom

and its adhesions in the light not only of the whole culture of the given peoples, but of all primitive and elemental psychology ; otherwise, tabulation leads to the pruning of facts, and a resulting neglect of essential characteristics which are apparently accidents. As MM. Langlois and Seignobos, our highest authorities on the methods of history, observe, the defect of statistical methods is that " they do not rest on a knowledge of the whole of the conditions under which the facts occur " (*Introduction to the Study of History*, p. 291, Eng. Trans.). So far as the data are correctly assigned and analysed, Professor Tylor's main results are, that there is a causal connection between (1) the mother-in-law avoidance custom and residence of the husband with the wife's family, (2) these and the custom of teknonymy (naming the parents after the child), (3) the couvade (the custom by which the husband pretends to lie-in) and temporary residence of the husband with the wife's family, (4) this temporary residence and marriage by capture. The cause, however, which he provisionally assumes is still the old maternal system, arising out of communism, with marriage by capture intervening to produce individual marriage. As will be seen, the cause which I suggest also serves to explain all these connections, and these statistical results, so far as they correctly represent the facts, supply a corroboration of the present theory. Many of the tables, however, when the customs are analysed, present a very different appearance.

The valuable series of fresh data, collected from the Dutch East Indies, did not lead the distinguished Dutch

ethnologist, the late Professor G. A. Wilken, to any new line of enquiry.

The late Professor Robertson Smith in 1885 first put one part of the problem, the question of the origin of bars to marriage, in a new light, by suggesting that whatever their origin, they are very early associated with the idea that it is not decent for housemates to intermarry (*Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*).

In 1890 Dr J. G. Frazer, in his monumental work *The Golden Bough* (second edition, 1900), which, like Professor Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, marks an epoch in the study of man, referred to the existence of a mass of facts showing that the origin of the marriage system was to be found in some primitive conception of danger attaching to the sexual act. This statement is the most important contribution yet made to the study of these questions. As will be seen, however, I do not confine the issue so narrowly.

In 1891 appeared Dr E. Westermarck's *History of Human Marriage* (third edition, 1901), which revolutionised the study of the origins and development of marriage. His most valuable contributions are that he weakened or destroyed several positions of the old theory of primitive communism and the matriarchate, and gave an excellent account of human marriage in its biological aspects. He, however, carries the biological method too far when he "applies biological analogies (selection, struggle for existence, inherited habits, and so on) to the explanation of social evolution, which is not produced by the operation of the same causes as

animal evolution" (Langlois and Seignobos, *op. cit.* p. 321), and not only takes no account of primitive psychology but neglects the importance of marriage ceremonies, of which he treats in one short chapter, without connecting them with other data. The general study not only of marriage ceremonies as a whole, which hitherto has not been systematically attempted, but of the whole question of marriage origins, is to be developed, as I have suggested, from that primitive religious mental habit, the characteristics of which have been so well analysed by Professor Tylor and in further issues by Dr Frazer.

I am much indebted to my friend Mr A. L. Bowley, one of our highest authorities on the methods of statistics, for working out for me some statistical problems.

E. C.

1902

CONTENTS

VOLUME I

EDITOR'S PREFACE . . . . . *Page* vii

TABLE OF THE CHIEF ADDITIONS TO THE FIRST EDITION . „ x

AUTHOR'S PREFACE . . . . . „ xi

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

Method of inquiry, 1-2—Typical problems, 2-3—Primitive thought and culture, 3-5—Religion in the relations of the sexes, both in ordinary life, marriage ceremonial and sexual crises, 6-12.

THE TABOO IMPOSED, CHAPTERS II-IX

CHAPTER II

TABOO

Taboo, 13—Social and sexual taboo, 13-15—Evil influences, 15-22—The abnormal and the new, 22-30—The supernatural character of emotions, of pain, of sickness, and of death, 30-37—Supernatural danger in human relations, 37-41.

CHAPTER III

SEXUAL TABOO

The relations of man and woman, 42-44—Sexual taboo, 44-52—Sexual solidarity and sexual antagonism, 52-58—Sexual taboo in religion, 58-61—Sex and occupations, 61-71—Sexual taboo at sexual crises, 71-77—The influence of sexual taboo on language, 77-83—Preliminary analysis of sexual taboo, 84-87.

CHAPTER IV

HUMAN RELATIONS

Evil spirits and material evil influences not distinguished, 88-91—Anthropomorphism, 91-93—Possession, 93—Personification and the memory-image, 94-95—The real and the ideal not distinguished, 95-96—Human and spiritual influence not distinguished, 96-104—In sexual and social relations human influence underlies spiritual, 104-106.

CHAPTER V

HUMAN RELATIONS (*Continued*)

Contact the test of human relations, both sexual and social, 107-111—Substance and accidents, 111-112—Material transmission of states and properties, the basis of sexual and social taboo, 112—Contagion of various human qualities and states, 112-123—Contagion of degradation, dullness, timidity, stupidity, weakness, effeminacy, pain, sin and crime, sickness and disease, death, beneficence, love, friendship, strength and courage, 124-137—Contagion by means of parts or properties of the body, clothes, food, various forms of contact, stepping over the shadow, sight or mere proximity, 138-152—The intention, 153-155—Oaths and ordeals, 156-157—The method of *ngadhungi*, 157-165.

CHAPTER VI

HUMAN RELATIONS (*Concluded*)

Care of functions and organs, 166-167—The mutilation of organs, 168-172—Disgust, uncleanness and shame in connection with sexual and social taboo, 172-174—Summary of the conceptions which underlie human relations, 174-176—Their result in primitive morality and etiquette, 176-181.

CHAPTER VII

COMMENSAL RELATIONS

Contact by means of food, 182-183—Importance of nutrition, 183-185—Fasting, 186—Forbidden food, 186-187—Transmission of properties by food, 188—Magic by means of food, 188-189—Eating in solitude, 190-191—Taboos against eating with others, 191-198—Taboos against eating with the opposite sex at sexual crises, 199-201—The same in ordinary life, 202-214.

CHAPTER VIII

SEXUAL RELATIONS

Contact by sexual intercourse, 215—Intercourse in secret, 215-217—Obscenity, 217—Modesty, 217-218—Fear in sexual intercourse, 218—Magic and the sexual organs, 218-221—Love-charms, 221-223—Contagion of weakness and effeminacy, 223-226—Sexual intercourse regarded as enervating and weakening, 226-229—The rupture of the *hymen*, 229-230—Beliefs concerning the origin of menstruation, 230-231—The serpent, 231-233—Seduction by evil spirits in human form, 233-235—Sun-taboos and their origin, 236-239—Sexual taboo and purification, 239-240.

CHAPTER IX

SEXUAL RELATIONS (*Continued*)

Transmission of male and female properties, 241-243—Women of masculine temperament in male clothes, 243-244—Women regarded as weak and timid, 244-249—Priests dressed in women's clothes, 250-251—Transmission of female weakness by contact, 251-254—Customs of dressing weak, effeminate and impotent men in women's clothes, 255-256—Transmission by blood cannot account for all the phenomena, 256-259—Summary of sexual taboo, 259-260—Its results in separating the young, both within and without the house, 260-269—Incest and promiscuity, 269-270.

THE TABOO REMOVED, CHAPTERS X-XIV

CHAPTER X

THE BREAKING OF TABOO

The breaking of taboo, 271—Avoiding the dangers of taboo by the use of barriers, veils, dummies and substitutes, 271-274—The sacrifice of a part to preserve the whole, 274-275—Fasting, 276—Purification from taboo, 276-278—Methods of removing taboo, 278-280—Inoculation, 280-284.

CHAPTER XI

THEORY OF UNION

Mutual inoculation and union, 285-286—The relation of *ngia ngiampe*, 287—Its use in love, hospitality, friendship, artificial brotherhood, the making of peace and in settling disputes, 288-296—Exchange of wives, 296-297—Guilds, 298—Its results in mutual respect and assistance, 298-300—The taboo resulting from it, 300-306—Summary of the *ngia ngiampe* relation, 306-309—The categories of union and identity, 309-311—The primitive conception of relationship, 311-314—Bars to marriage, 314-316.

CHAPTER XII

THEORY OF CHANGE AND EXCHANGE

Disguise, 317-318—Wearing the dress of the opposite sex, 318-320—Change of name and of identity, 321-324—The idea of new life at initiation, at puberty and at periodic festivals, 324-329—New food, 329-331—Representatives and substitutes, 332—New dress, 333—Disguise and change pass into exchange, 333—Saturnalia, 333-335—Exchange of wives, 335-337—The nature of the kiss, 338-343—Its history, 343-359—The breaking of taboo, 359—Union, 360—Duplicates and proxies, 360-361—Promiscuity, 362-363—Funeral observances, 363-365—Scapegoats, 366—War-dances, 366-367—The nature of the dance, 367-372—The principle of make-believe in custom, etiquette and punishment, 372-375.

THE MYSTIC ROSE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

All study of the origins of social institutions must be based on what ethnology can tell us of the psychology of the lower races and on the primitive conceptions of human relations which are thus established. It is only in early modes of thought that we can find the explanation of ceremonies and systems which originated in primitive society ; and, if ceremony and system are the concrete forms in which human relations are expressed, an examination, ethnological and psychological, of human relations, is indispensable for enquiry into human institutions. It is necessary to lay stress upon this principle, for students of the history of marriage have hitherto ignored it, or rather, while using the facts of ethnology, have shown no sympathy with primitive thought. They have interpreted primitive custom by ideas which are far from primitive, which, in fact, are relatively late and belong to the legal stage of human culture. The attribution of legal conceptions to primitive thought has had the usual effect of *a priori* theory, and has checked enquiry.

In his *History of Human Marriage*[1] Dr Westermarck made a much-needed protest, and refuted several of these pseudo-syntheses. In the constructive portion of his

[1] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1891 [5th ed. 1921, 3 vols.]).

work he uses the biological argument. This was also necessary; the facts of biology must supply the preliminaries of investigation. But he goes too far with biology in one direction, and in another not far enough. The latter line of enquiry is sex. One of the most remarkable defects of the legal school of anthropology is its neglect to take sexual relations into account when discussing a sexual relation like that of marriage.

In the following pages we have followed the principle that marriage, both in ceremony and in system, is grounded in primitive conceptions of sexual relations. Many collateral phenomena will be discussed, which illustrate and are themselves explained by these conceptions, and though the lines of the argument lead from human relations through sexual relations to meet in marriage, yet by the way they will touch upon the connection of morality and religion with the social life of mankind.

At the outset it may be well to bring forward a few striking facts of custom, as types of the problems to be solved, and as a help towards clearness. Such are the following, which may be put, after the fashion of Plutarch, as questions:

(1) Why, according to a very general custom, are husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, required to avoid each other in one or more ways, and why, in particular, may they not eat together?

(2) Why do betrothed persons also, as is frequently the case, avoid each other with religious caution?

(3) Why, again, do men and women, generally, practice the same religious caution of each other?

(4) Why, according to a common custom, is it

necessary for the bridegroom to take his bride by violence? ("Marriage by capture.")

(5) Why are the bride and bridegroom in, for instance, Bengal, first married to two trees?

(6) Why did the bride in ancient Argos wear a beard in the bridal chamber, and why in Kos was the bridegroom arrayed in women's clothes when he received his bride?

(7) Why, according to a widely spread custom, which, like the next, has excited the laughter of mankind, should a man and his mother-in-law religiously avoid each other to the extent of hiding the face and of being "ashamed"?

(8) Why, as is the practice in several parts of the world, and as was reported of the Tibarenoi by Greek writers, and of the King of Torelore by the *jogleor* who wrote *Cest daucassin et de nicolete*,[1] does the husband lie-in and pretend to be a mother when his wife is confined? (*Couvade*).

The primitive mental habit in its general features is best described negatively by the term *unscientific*, and positively by *religious*, in the ordinary connotation of that term. *Superstitious* would be preferable, were it not too narrow; as to *magic*, we do not here distinguish —magic being simply the superstitious or religious *method* as opposed to the scientific.[2] This primitive

[1] [For marriage customs in the 13th century, see *e.g.*, B. Barth, *Liebe und Ehe im altfranzösischen Fablel und in der mittelhochdeutschen Novelle* (1910), and O. Zollinger, *Die Eheschliessung im Nibelungenlied und in der Gudrun* (1923); *cp.* M. Lacombe, *Essai sur la Coutume Poitevine du mariage* (1910).]

[2] [The suggestions put forward in this paragraph have since been exhaustively developed by M. Lévy-Bruhl, in his *Les fonctions mentales dans les sociétés inférieures* (1910), and *Primitive Mentality* (1923), whose views, apart from what appears to me to be the weakest part of them—his theory about "collective representations"—are indistinguishable from those expressed in the present work.]

thinking does not distinguish between the natural and the supernatural, between subjective and objective reality. Primitive man regards the creations of his own imagination as being no less real than the existences for which he has the evidence of sense-perception, in a way more real, precisely because they elude sense-perception, though dealt with in the same way as objective reality; and, while the latter is always changing, these ideal existences, like the ideas of Plato, never pass away. Objective reality also takes on some properties of ideal reality, so that for primitive man the supernatural and the natural interchange, or rather, are not distinguished. This philosophy is truly monistic, and is neither materialist nor idealist, but undifferentiated. Matter is spiritual, and spirit is material, though sometimes invisible. Primitive logic corresponds to this metaphysic; it is likewise undifferentiated and is chiefly guided by "material fallacies" and a Realism more pronounced than that of the Schoolmen. Such inference necessarily includes true results, inductive and deductive, but no less necessarily these true results are not distinguished from the false; inextricably confused with fallacy, which often owes its continuance to the association, truth is held but is not recognised as a distinct species. As to "survivals" of primitive speculation and custom into civilised periods and places, the term is misused when it is implied that these are dead forms, surviving like fossil remains or rudimentary organs; the fact is that human nature remains fundamentally primitive, and it is not easy even for those most favoured by descent to rise above these primitive ideas, precisely because these ideas "spring eternally" from permanent functional causes. Every one would still be primitive were it not for education and environment, and the importance of

these elements in the evolution of the race can hardly be over-estimated.

The undifferentiated character of primitive culture, its reference of all departments of thought and practice to one psychological habit, the superstitious or religious, may be illustrated from higher stages. "The political and religious Governments of the Kaffir tribes are so intimately connected that the one cannot be overturned without the other; they must stand or fall together."[1] The great pagan civilisations show exactly the same homogeneity. The ideal society of early Christians was one where there should be no separation between Church and State, where public and private life and thought, politics and domestic affairs, individual and social morality, speculation and science, should all be subsumed under religion, and directed by the religious method. Such an ideal differs in degree only from the actual condition of primitive society; whatever term be used to describe this, it is homogeneous and monistic in practice and theory; one method is applied to its philosophy of nature and of man, its politics and public life, its sociology and human relations, domestic and social, its medical science and practice, its ethics and morality, its ordinary thought and action in everyday life, its behaviour and etiquette. Thus, as will also be shown by the way, there is a religious meaning inherent in the primitive conception and practice of all human relations, a meaning which is always ready to become actualised; and the same is true of all individual processes of sense and emotion and intellection and, in especial, of those functional processes that are most easily seen in their working and results. Not only "the Master knot of

[1] J. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (1858), p. 107.

Human Fate," but all human actions and relations, all individual and social phenomena, have for primitive man, always potentially and often actually, a full religious content. So it is with that sub-division of human nature and human life caused by sex ; all actions and relations, all individual and social phenomena conditioned by sex, are likewise filled with a religious meaning. Sexual relations and sexual processes, as all human relations and human processes, are religious to the primitive mind. The conception of danger, neither material nor spiritual, but both, which is the chief characteristic of early religious thought and practice, and which is due to the unscientific character of early speculation, is here intensified by the importance, psychical and physiological, of the sexual life. As we proceed, this characteristic of sexual relations and sexual life, will be made clear ; it is seen in the phenomena of the individual life and of social relations, both in ordinary circumstances and, naturally intensified, in sexual crises. Thus, birth and baptism, confirmation and marriage, are attended by religious ceremonies. There is indeed a tendency amongst enquirers, due to the legal method of investigation, to ignore the religious character of the marriage ceremony ; but it is only in later culture that marriage is a "civil act," and though in early Catholic times marriage was not necessarily performed by the Church, it was still in essence a religious rite, and had been so before Christianity, and was so in the earliest ages. One of the crudest modes of marriage known, that of the Arunta and other Central Australian tribes, is proved by a note of Messrs Spencer and Gillen to be a religious act,[1] though to all appearance this would

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 93.

seem impossible. As we shall see, even the ordinary intercourse of man with woman has for primitive man this religious meaning.

The primitive conception of danger, which leads to these precautions, religious or superstitious, so characteristic of early ritual, appears in two forms, the predication of evil influences and the imposition of taboos. Let us take a few preliminary instances, from ordinary life, and from sexual crises. In the Marquesas Islands the use of canoes is prohibited to the female sex by taboo: the breaking of the rule is punished with death. *Tapa*-making belongs exclusively to women, and it is taboo for men to touch it.[1] The Kaffirs will not from superstitious motives allow women to touch their cattle.[2] Amongst the Dakotas custom and superstition ordain that the wife must carefully keep away from all that belongs to her husband's sphere.[3] In New Zealand, to mention only one more of many similar cases, a man who has any important business in hand, either in peace or in war, is taboo and must keep away from the female sex.[4]

The fear of evil spirits shows itself from time to time during the long and wearisome marriage ceremonies of South Celebes, and methods are used to frustrate their evil intentions against the happiness of the young pair. There is also a fear that the soul of the bridegroom may

[1] H. Melville, *Narrative of a four months' residence among the natives of the Marquesas Islands* (1846), pp. 13, 245.

[2] E. Holub, "The Central South African Tribes," *J.A.I* (1881), x. 11; cp. H. L. Roth, "On the Origin of Agriculture," *J.A.I* (1887), xvi. 119.

[3] [H. R. Schoolcraft, *Historical and Statistical Information respecting . . . the Indian tribes of the United States* (1851-1860), iii. 230.]

[4] [E. Dieffenbach, *Travels in New Zealand* (1843), ii. 85-86.]

fly away from sheer happiness.[1] In China, a new bride is apt to be attacked by evil spirits, causing her to be ill; hence the figure of "a great magician" (a Taoist priest), brandishing a sword, is painted on the sedan-chair which she uses on the wedding-day.[2] The sedan-chair in which a Manchu bride goes to the house of the bridegroom, is "disinfected" with incense to drive away evil spirits, and in it is placed a calendar containing the names of idols who control the spirits of evil.[3] The Druses "have a superstition that leads them to suppose that Gins or evil spirits are more than usually busy on the occasion of marriage," and may interfere with the happiness of the pair.[4] In English folklore "the malevolence of witchcraft seems to have taken the greatest pleasure in subtle assaults upon those just entering the married state."[5] In Russia all doors, windows, and even the chimney, are closed at a wedding, to prevent malicious witches flying in and hunting the bride and bridegroom.[6] The Chuvashes honour their wizards (*iemzyas*) and always invite them to weddings, for fear that an offended *iemzya* might destroy the bride and bridegroom.[7]

Savages, in common, we may add, with the rest of mankind, are very secretive concerning their functional life. This attitude is emphasised when the sexual act is in question. Thus amongst the natives of the Ceramlaut

[1] B. F. Matthes, *Bijdragen tot de Ethnologie van Zuid-Celebes* (1875), pp. 30, 33, 39; R. van Eck, "De Mangkasaren en Boegineezen," *De Indische Gids* (1881), III. ii. 1038.

[2] J. Doolittle, *Social Life of the Chinese* (1867), i. 95.

[3] J. H. S. Lockhart, "The Marriage Ceremonies of the Manchus," *Folk-Lore* (1890), i. 487.

[4] G. W. Chasseaud, *The Druses of the Lebanon* (1849), p. 168.

[5] J. Brand, *Popular Antiquities* (1849), iii. 305.

[6] W. R. S. Ralston, *The Songs of the Russian People* (1872), p. 381.

[7] V. M. Mikhailovskii, "Shamanism in Siberia," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 156.

Archipelago, between Celebes and Papua, where there is a veneer of Islam, it is the custom for both man and wife to say the well-known formula of good Muslims before the sexual act.[1] This is indeed a general rule in Islam, especially on the first night of marriage.[2] The old Romans similarly invoked *Dea Virginensis* while ceremonially loosing the zone.[3] The natives of Amboina believe in a witch, *Pontianak*, who steals away not only infants, but the genital organs of men.[4] In South Celebes the evil spirit most feared by the male sex is one that makes a man incapable of performing his marital duties.[5] A similar belief is very common in European folklore.

[Again, as we shall see later,[6] these beliefs and taboos apply with still greater force to women at their sexual crises. At puberty, during the menstrual periods, in pregnancy, at and after child-birth, women are more in danger from evil influences than normally, and are therefore themselves more particularly taboo than commonly.] In all these relations and functional crises connected with sex, a religious state is, as it were, entered upon. There is not needed to prove this the major premiss that all primitive practice and belief are essentially religious ; the particular instances which we shall survey themselves point clearly to a connection with religion.

It may be objected that the presence of evil spirits in some of these cases proves nothing. But all we wish to point out just now is the actual presence of evil or danger. We are far from wishing to imply that the evil spirits or dangerous influences present on all these

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroésharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 173.

[2] A. Bastian, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (1860), iii. 293.

[3] St Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, iv. 11.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

[5] B. F. Matthes, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

[6] [Below, i. 71 *et seq.*]

occasions are those against which the ceremonies of baptism, marriage and the like, were instituted as safeguards. In some of these cases the evil influence stated is that which has caused the rite or taboo; in others it is not so; other cases again are examples of a belief in the process of crystallisation into ceremony, superimposed upon an already crystallised ceremony of similar origin, such as in the cases of marriage taken from South Celebes, Manchuria and Russia; whilst yet others show an original ceremony in the process of development from belief, as in the cases of the Indian girl at puberty,[1] and the Veddas at menstruation,[2] and in those above of the Muslim and Roman bridegrooms, where the Roman ceremony is obviously the crystallisation of an idea similar to the Muslim. In the higher stages of culture it is hardly necessary to quote instances to prove that baptism, confirmation, the "churching" of women and marriage, are religious ceremonies, but it is important to mark the continuity of these with the ritual of early man. A long array of facts might be given to show that the main line of development in ritual is from the propitiation or insulation of evil influences to the conciliation of beneficent powers. The change is effected in this way: the dangers feared are originally insulated before and during the exercise of the function, as is the natural course, then, at the end of the use of the function, the expulsion of the dangers is performed for the last time and often shows a twofold character, purification and propitiation, such as, to take the case of child-birth, the purification of the woman with water and the propitiation of the spirits by food. The practice of performing the chief ceremony at the end of a functional crisis was more sure of continuance, precisely

[1] [Below, i. 75.] [2] [Below, i. 76.]

because the danger is then usually over, and the ceremony therefore cannot be discredited. Further, keeping the same instance of purification after child-birth, the deliverance from danger is naturally ascribed to some beneficent spirit, and the water with which the woman is purified of that danger takes on the character of "holy" accordingly. The examples drawn from the Veddas [1] and from an East Central African tribe [2] are here instructive, as showing the necessary components of a ceremony and illustrating its origin.

We must next point out the fact that the rules and restrictions (taboos) imposed in these sexual relations or sexual crises, some of which are expressly called taboo, are identical with those imposed in other taboo states such as hunting, war and the preparation therefor, mourning, also in the case of those sacred persons, at once more and less than man, of whom Sir James Frazer treats in his great work. But the plurality of causes, which makes it unsafe to infer similarity of cause from similar effects, necessitates an analysis of particular results.

The ideas underlying these examples of taboo are in some cases connected with "spiritual" dangers and, to that extent, are religious. In the further analysis of these and other cases, the religious character of practice and belief will be made more clear, and the precise nature of the danger will be investigated. For the present let us take one or two of these cases, which might be multiplied indefinitely, to show the identity of the ideas underlying Polynesian taboo and similar religious states elsewhere. A Maori woman at menstruation is taboo and anyone touching her is taboo. Now, the Siamese, who imagine that evil spirits swarm in the air, believe

[1] [Below, i. 76.] [2] [Below, i. 74.]

that it is these who enjoy the first-fruits of their girls and who cause the "wound" which renews itself every month, a "wound" of which the menstrual blood is the result and proof.[1] It is contact with this blood of which the Maori male is so afraid; add to this the fact that the Maoris themselves not only identify menstrual blood with an evil spirit, *Kahukahu*, but also hold that the taboo state generally is due to the influence of ancestral spirits,[2] and identification of taboo and "spiritual" influence is so far complete.

Now, if behind any sexual relation or sexual functional crisis, and behind the relations between the sexes resulting in connection with it, there are found ideas identical with those underlying any taboo or religious condition, we may infer for all such ideas in primitive thought not only correlation but identity of origin.

As we proceed we shall find evidence not only for identifying this religious state of "spiritual" danger with the dangers underlying taboo, and with those proceeding from evil agencies, material, spiritual, or both, but also for ascribing this state to the functional crises of sex and the ensuing sexual attitude, and even to the ordinary relations of the sexes.

[1] S. de La Loubère, *Du royaume de Siam* (1691), i. 203.

[2] E. Shortland, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand* (1851), pp. 67-68.

THE TABOO IMPOSED

CHAPTER II

TABOO

We have seen reason to suppose that men and women at marriage, women during menstruation, pregnancy and child-birth, boys and girls at puberty, infants, not to mention other critical conditions and circumstances, are regarded by early man as being in that mysterious religious state which necessitates the imposition of restrictions and safeguards, of taboos in a word, and to which mourners and kings, warriors and priests alike are called. In the last case cited from the Maoris we see very clearly the two-fold nature of the state in which these *sacrae personae* find themselves. Sir James Frazer has here most happily applied the language of electricity. The person charged with this electric force, which is both dangerous and beneficent, must be insulated by various taboos.

The Polynesian taboo, especially in Hawaii and New Zealand, is the basis of society; it is the support of all religious, moral and social institutions, for all of which it supplies a supernatural sanction. The system is indeed a good example of the religious character of early society. Used by priests and nobles for their own ends and no less for the good of the community, it early divided into religious, political and social taboo. Every priest and every gentleman is *tabu*, "sacred." The

opposite state is *noa*, "common." This is the system after a long development. Here we wish to deal rather with the ideas underlying taboo in its human aspect. These are universal human ideas, arising directly from the simplest human relations and physical functions, and we therefore propose, after having shown cause why the identity should be recognised, to apply the term taboo to all similar phenomena throughout mankind, and not only to the restrictions but to the whole series of persons, beliefs and practices. All these are potentially what the Polynesian taboo is actually. Also, as will be seen, taboo as thus extended is identical with a considerable part of religion in the sense already described as characteristic of primitive culture. We do not wish to imply that these ideas underlying taboo have developed the whole of religion ; and, as in this enquiry we have to discuss the relations of man with man and of man with woman, that is, taboo in its social aspect, the terms Social Taboo and Sexual Taboo may well be used. They will serve both to avoid misconceptions as to religion in general, and to mark the fact that here we meet with fundamental ideas which lie beneath the relations of man with man and beneath the system of morality derived from those relations. In those ideas may be seen the basis of evolutionary ethics.

Primitive taboo exists now in all its pristine strength, though it has split into religious, moral and social habits, each distinguished by a more or less different terminology. To illustrate the continuity of culture and the identity of the elementary human ideas in all ages, it is sufficient to point to the ease with which the word taboo has passed into modern languages [since Captain Cook first described the Tongan system only a century and a half ago].[1]

[1] *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean* (1784).

There is no more interesting or more important study than to trace the continuity of culture, and when we take any taboo custom of early man and follow it up to modern times, we find at our end not a mere survival but a living duplicate, often identical in form and content with its prototype. Many cases of this will appear in the following pages. As an example we may quote a common feature of primitive taboo in its social aspect, the placing of a cloth or stick or other mark on a piece of property to show that it belongs to some one and is therefore sacred. Well, at this end of the chain we find the same thing in the familiar piece of unwritten law which respects the seat thus tabooed in a railway carriage. The only difference is that in the Polynesian case there is a deep religious meaning behind the form and a terrible supernatural sanction to support it, while in the modern custom there is human courtesy only ; behind both there is the universal sense of human nature. Indeed, as we shall see later, such an example points to the fact that ordinary universal human ideas, chiefly connected with functional needs, produce the same results in all ages ; and many so-called survivals, which have on the face of them too much vitality to be mere fossil remains, at once receive a scientific explanation which is more than antiquarian.

Having found that the persons with whom we have to deal are, so far, taboo, in danger and dangerous, and concern us in their human relations, which are governed by what we call social taboo, we now proceed to investigate the nature of this danger, apart from the vague though ubiquitous evil spirits. The omnipresence of evil spirits according to early thought has been often illustrated, but, to point the case, we may give some evidence of this here.

An excellent observer says of the Indian of British Guiana that "his whole world swarms with beings. He is surrounded by a host of them, possibly hurtful. It is therefore not wonderful that the Indian fears to be without his fellow, fears even to move beyond the light from his camp-fire, and when obliged to do so carries a firebrand with him, that he may have a chance of seeing the beings among whom he moves. Nor is it wonderful that occasionally the neighbourhood of their settlement seems to the Indians to become so oppressively full of gathering beings, that the *peaiman* who has the power of frightening these beings, even when they are invisible, is employed to effect a general clearance of the air."[1] [However dreadful the belief in such ambient powers for evil must be, these Indians are at least fortunate to have among themselves one who can fight these powers on a footing higher even than one of equality. This is not always the case. Thus] among the Sonthals evil spirits are ubiquitous, and offerings of grain are placed on the paths to appease them.[2] [We shall find the same limitation of defensive powers among other peoples. The Khonds of Orissa have tutelary deities who have power over the operations of nature and over everything relating to human life in it. The number of these deities is unlimited; not only do they fill all nature, they are also cognizant of every human action, want and interest.[3] While these deities may act for good, that is not the case in Siam, where the evil spirits that swarm in the air are believed by the people, as we have already seen, to enjoy the first-fruits of the virgins.[4]

[1] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana* (1883), p. 372.

[2] V. Ball, *Jungle Life in India* (1880), p. 235.

[3] S. C. Macpherson, *Memorials of Service in India* (1865), p. 90.

[4] S. de La Loubère, *Du royaume de Siam* (1691), i. 203.

In Africa we find that in the opinion of the Malinke, a people of Mandingo stock, our planet is peopled by a multitude of spirits.[1] The Bantus of West Africa hold the universe to be peopled with a crowd of spirits, almost all of whom are malevolent.[2] In Egypt the *Ginn* pervade everything; they inhabit rivers, ruins, houses, wells, baths, ovens and latrines. Hence, when entering the last-mentioned place, when letting down a bucket into a well, and when doing any one of many other things, it is the custom to exclaim, "Permission," or "Permission, ye blessed," which words are sometimes prefaced by a prayer for protection against evil spirits.[3] The Algonkin Indians base their religion on the belief "that the whole visible and invisible creation is animated with various orders of malignant or benign spirits, who preside over the daily affairs and over the final destinies of men."[4] The Ten'a of the Yukon Valley believe themselves to be in almost continual intercourse with certain undesirable denizens of the spirit-world. Manifestations of these spirits are as familiar to the Ten'a as the blowing of the wind or the singing of the birds. On one occasion Father Jetté, who reports these facts, was present when a spirit was sighted; he started in pursuit of the monster, and when he failed to find any signs of it, the Indians said with relief: "And it is well for you that you did not! He would have eaten you up!"[5] In short, not to multiply instances, among all the American

[1] — Brun, "Notes sur les croyances . . . des Malinkés fetichistes," *Anthropos* (1907), ii. 728.

[2] M. H. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa* (1897), p. 443.

[3] E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (1871), i. 282.

[4] H. R. Schoolcraft, *Algie Researches* (1839), i. 41.

[5] J. Jetté, "On the Superstitions of the Ten'a Indians," *Anthropos* (1911), vi. 721-722.

natives "any remarkable features in natural scenery or dangerous places became objects of superstitious dread and veneration, because they were supposed to be the abodes of gods." [1]

The Maoris of New Zealand think that all the natural features of their country are inhabited by hordes of monstrous beings.[2] The same belief was held by the Tasmanians, the crevices and caverns of whose rocky mountains were tenanted for them by a plurality of powerful and evil-disposed beings.[3] As for the aborigines of Australia, "the number of supernatural beings, feared if not loved, that they acknowledge, is exceedingly great; for not only are the heavens peopled with such, but the whole face of the country swarms with them; every thicket, most watering-places, and all rocky places abound with evil spirits." [4] In certain cases the natives do not seem to make a clear distinction between the evil potentialities of these omnipresent spirits and the evil that may surround them through human agencies.] In one respect, it is said, the life of the Kurnai was one of dread. "He lived in fear of the visible and invisible. He never knew the moment when the lurking *Brajerak* might not spear him from behind, and never knew the moment when some secret foe among the Kurnai might not succeed in passing over him some spell, against which he could not struggle, or from which the most potent counter-charms given him by his ancestors could not free him." [5] The natives of Hatam in New Guinea had a

[1] R. M. Dorman, *The Origin of Primitive Superstitions* (1881), p. 300.

[2] R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui* (1870), pp. 49, 53; E. Shortland, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand* (1851), pp. 53 *et seq.*

[3] F. R. Nixon, *The Cruise of the Beacon* (1857), p. 182.

[4] A. Oldfield, "On the Aborigines of Australia," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London* (1865), n.s., iii. 228.

[5] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), p. 259.

great dread of poison infused into the atmosphere.[1] Thus these last two cases form a link between the natural and the supernatural.

We see from these few typical examples that in the thought of many peoples man's whole environment is more or less full of the agencies or influences of evil. As we may presuppose the same psychological material for all mankind, we may infer a similarity of psychological result for all peoples at a given stage of culture, [nor have the recent studies of the diffusionist school of ethnologists shown sufficient reason for doubting this general conclusion, one which is strongly supported by the universality of the belief in these ubiquitous spirits].

The term "evil spirit" is often misused: many evil influences which are not anthropomorphic at all are too readily called "spirits." Supernatural personification will not cover all the cases of primitive spiritualism. These dangers are still indifferentiated and combined in one *genus* in which there is no distinction between natural and supernatural, real and ideal, nor between persons and other existences or *entiae*. These "spirits" are really material, though unseen, and many are simply "influences," states of matter, impersonal forces. The atmosphere is thus charged with "spiritual" electricity, with bacteria of invisible mischief. Man needs to walk warily: at any time he may be subjected to dangers coming from this hylo-idealistic force. The conduction or induction, contagion or infection, may result in death or sickness, spiritual or material danger, real or but vaguely apprehended.

These influences are of the kind which produce the state of religious peril or taboo. When we take our

[1] L. M. d'Albertis, *New Guinea* (1880), i. 122.

attention from the mysterious force of taboo and analyse its subject, we find that it is the "spiritual" danger which makes him taboo and dangerous to others as soon as it descends upon and fills him with virus or electric force. It is no inconsistency that a man is often taboo before the danger attacks him, for he is expecting it, or that people like Sir James Frazer's incarnate gods or even the ordinary Maori gentleman, are always taboo. These *sacrae personae* have the religious condition imposed upon them every day, they are *cottidie feriatae*. It is a natural extension with persons on whom the safety of the world depends, as in the case of the incarnate gods, and no less with persons like the Maori, who has been led by the development of a system combining the characteristics of Roman Catholicism with those of Feudalism, to believe, like many a modern aristocrat, that he is somewhat more than the salt of the earth.

The next commonest form in which the danger resulting in taboo is presented, is that of contagion of a sickness neither real nor imaginary, neither natural nor supernatural, but both. This predication of "spiritual" sickness, though almost universal, and, as will be seen, of very great importance in the history of human relations, does not cover all the facts, for we also want to know the origin of this idea. We have found the danger to come from the environment of the individual and then to settle upon him. We may then look for its original character in the actual environment, not as it may really be, but as it is conceived to be, that is, as it is conditioned by the individual's conception of it; and further, in that part of the individual's environment which is humanity, we may look for it in the characteristics attributed by him to his fellows who form that human environment. Now we find after

examining the facts that there is one characteristic which inheres in all these manifold dangers feared by primitive man. Things and persons are potentially dangerous, acts and functions are potentially liable to danger, which are strange, unfamiliar, unusual, abnormal, in a word, more or less unknown. Man's ignorance is the occasion of his fears, and he fears anything and everything which he does not understand. Of the savage it may most truly be said, *omnia exeunt in mysterium*. Man's superstitious fears are found to be in the exact ratio of man's ignorance. To all these potential dangers he naturally ascribes the results which he knows to ensue from real physical danger, and of course this wide generalisation includes cases of real injury inextricably confused with a thousand empty terrors. As man's earliest thinking is anthropomorphic, in terms of himself, he attributes to agencies he cannot understand not only the conscious powers and methods of human beings, but the involuntary influence or deleterious properties of dangerous men, such as enemies or diseased persons; and these imaginary results coming from things and persons feared because they are not understood, are actually accentuated by the very fact that the things or persons do not harmonise with man's knowledge of himself. Wonder becomes uneasiness, and eventually produces an attitude of religious caution. Again, man's fears are for himself, and especially for those parts and functions of his organism which are most important for life and health and are actually most liable to injury. Here there falls to be considered what may be called physiological thought, subconsciously arising from and concentrating upon physiological functions. Especially important in human psychology is the physiological thought arising from the two chief physical functions of

nutrition and of sex. For these and other complex and delicate functions, man's ignorance creates many potential dangers, and this leads to various attitudes of religious caution in their performance.

Let us take some cases which illustrate this potentiality of danger inhering through man's subjective conceptions, in things and acts and states which are different from what is usual and ordinary, which more or less break the comfortable routine of life, or which he cannot explain. [Not the least striking support which this theory receives is that of a linguistic nature. The Dakotas, for instance, refer to their deities by a term, *wakan*, which they use also for anything they cannot understand, for whatever is "wonderful, mysterious, superhuman or supernatural."[1] In Fiji "the native word expressive of divinity is *kalou*, which, while used to denote the people's highest notion of a god, is also constantly heard as a qualification of anything great or marvellous."[2] We have seen that the Maori term, *noa* means common, as opposed to *tapu*,[3] and common in the sense of normal or regular. Further, the Maori word for god is *atua*, which is also used for spirits in general and, significantly, for all things they do not understand, including not only exotic objects like a compass or a barometer, but menstruation and the like.][4] In South Celebes the Buginese word *pemâli*, which corresponds to taboo, denotes all things unusual and such as are supposed to bring evil consequences in

[1] H. R. Schoolcraft, *Historical and Statistical Information Respecting . . . the Indian Tribes of the United States* (1851-1860), iv. 642.

[2] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 183.

[3] [Above, i. 13-14.]

[4] E. Best, "The Lore of the *Whare-Kohanga*," *Journal of the Polynesian Society* (1905), xiv. 210.

their train.[1] These examples show how strangeness, potential danger and spiritual power go together in the savage mind. "The Masai conception of deity (*ngăi*) is vague," as Joseph Thomson pointed out. "I was *Ngăi*. My language was *Ngăi*. . . . In fact, whatever struck them as strange or incomprehensible, that they at once assumed had some connection with *Ngăi*."[2] [This report is confirmed by other travellers among the Masai, who render this word *ngăi* by "the Unknown."[3] The Monbuttu word for deity is *kilima*, which they also use for thunder, shadows and reflections, in short, for whatever they cannot understand.[4] Precisely the same thing was reported of the Malagasy by Ellis; these natives use the same term, *ndria manitra*, both for god and for anything beyond the reach of their understanding.[5]

Apart from this linguistic evidence, a considerable body of facts can be quoted to show the danger held to inhere in the strange and unknown. We can distinguish here between different kinds of strangeness; a first group can be formed of things abnormal. Thus we have seen that the American Indians dread those features of natural scenery which are remarkable or dangerous.][6] Of the Guiana Indian Sir Everard Im Thurn states that if "he sees anything in any way curious or abnormal, and if soon after an evil befall him, he regards the thing and the evil as cause and effect. Just as some rocks, *viz.* the more peculiar, are more malignant than others, so it is not every river, but every bend and portion of a river that has a spirit; spirits of falls and rapids are still

[1] B. F. Matthes, *Bijdragen tot de Ethnologie van Zuid-Celebes* (1875), p. 108.

[2] J. Thomson, *Through Masai Land* (1887), p. 260.

[3] S. L. *and* H. Hinde, *The Last of the Masai* (1901), p. 99.

[4] G. Burrows, *The Land of the Pigmies* (1898), p. 100.

[5] W. Ellis, *History of Madagascar* (1838), i. 390.

[6] [Above, i. 18.]

more dreaded, therefore people are more frequently drowned there."[1] The Kadiaks believed that every act is done under the influence of some object, stone or the like, especially if the said object is strange in appearance.[2] [Among the Samoyeds "a curiously twisted tree, a stone with an uncommon shape would receive, and in some quarters still receives, not only veneration but actual ceremonial worship."[3] The Ostyaks worshipped only such natural objects as were abnormal in shape or quality.[4] The Lapps made offerings in addition to such places as were difficult to pass or where an accident or some other abnormal event had occurred.[5] The Ainu of Japan deify all objects and phenomena which appear to them extraordinary or dreadful.[6] In China "a steep mountain, or any mountain at all remarkable, is supposed to have a special local spirit, who acts as guardian."][7] The crowing of a hen is regarded in Chinese folklore, as well as in European, as ominous of something unusual about to happen.[8] Similarly, when animals act in a manner contrary to their ordinary habits, the Kaffirs of Natal regard such actions as omens.[9] They honour persons who are subject to fits, though they refuse to eat out of such a person's vessels.[10] These natives begin the career of diviner or doctor by being ill, and especially

[1] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *op. cit.*, pp. 370 *et seq.*

[2] U. Lisiansky, *A Voyage Round the World* (1814), p. 243.

[3] F. G. Jackson, "Notes on the Samoyads of the Great Tundra," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 398.

[4] M. A. Castrén, *Nordiska resor och forskningar* (1852-1858), iii. 227.

[5] *Ibid.*, iii. 210.

[6] K. Sugamata, "Notes ethnographiques sur les Aïnos," quoted in *L'Anthropologie* (1899), x. 98.

[7] J. Edkins, *Religion in China* (1878), p. 221.

[8] J. Doolittle, *Social Life of the Chinese* (1867), ii. 328.

[9] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), p. 165.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 218.

the appearance of epileptic symptoms in a Kaffir shows that he is becoming a seer.[1] Very similarly neuropaths are much honoured in the islands of Leti, Moa and Lakor.[2] The Bakgalagali, a weak and timorous race, are protected by the notion that it is uncanny to meddle with them.[3] And with the former case may be compared that of the Patagonians, among whom any unfamiliar object was supposed to possess an evil spirit; and any boy or girl who was odd or peculiar was marked out for the profession of wizard.[4] [To return, we find that the natives of Sierra Leone dedicate to their spirits places which "inspire the spectator with awe, or are remarkable for their appearance, as immensely large trees rendered venerable by age, rocks appearing in the midst of rivers, and having something peculiar in their form, in short, whatever appears to them strange or uncommon."[5] The natives of the Gold Coast worship and propitiate the spirit which they believe to occupy any remarkable natural feature.[6] "In Morocco places of striking appearance are generally supposed to be haunted by *jnûn* (*jinn*) or are associated with some dead saints."[7] All these cases show the fear of and respect for common and natural things which have something abnormal

[1] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), p. 299; J. Shooter, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 378.

[3] W. H. R. Bevan, "Some Beliefs Concerning the Bakgalagali," *Folk-Lore Journal* (Cape Town, 1880), ii. 32 *n.*

[4] G. C. Musters, *At Home with the Patagonians* (1873), pp. 181-182.

[5] T. Winterbottom, *An Account of the Native Africans in the Neighbourhood of Sierra Leone* (1803), i. 223.

[6] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples of the Gold Coast of West Africa* (1887), p. 21.

[7] E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), ii. 589.

about them. Dr Marett has shown good cause, on the basis of some of these cases, for believing the feelings which we are surveying, feelings of mystic strangeness, or of awe, to use his terminology, to be as primitive as any known to us, and certainly pre-animistic.[1] An opportunity occurs here to emphasise again that the term primitive is used in a purely relative sense, as indicating stage of development and not age. "Indeed," as Dr Westermarck points out, "the superstitious dread of unusual objects is not altogether dead even among ourselves. It survives in England to this day in the habit of ascribing grotesque and striking landmarks or puzzling antiquities to the devil, who became the residuary legatee of obsolete superstitions in Christian countries."[2]

We must now proceed to consider briefly the fear inspired by new things.] Amongst the commonest cases are those borderline ones where potentiality of danger is ascribed to strangers.[3] The Guaranis suspected every stranger of hostility.[4] [The Gambier Islanders took the newly arrived missionaries for malevolent gods come to do them harm.[5] The Savage Islanders in Western Polynesia, one of the latest groups of natives in that region to be reached by the missionaries, were found to believe that not only all foreigners but all natives who had come into contact with them as well, were bringers

[1] R. R. Marett, *The Threshold of Religion* (1914), pp. 96-97; cp. F. B. Jevons, *An Introduction to the History of Religion* (1902), p. 71.

[2] E. Westermarck, *op. cit.*, ii. 589-590; cp. Sir A. C. Lyall, *Asiatic Studies* (1882), p. 9.

[3] [The whole subject of the treatment of strangers has been exhaustively discussed by Dr Westermarck, *op. cit.*, see Index, *s.v.*, and by Sir P. J. H. Grierson, "Strangers," *E.R.E.* (1920), xi. 883-896; and general taboos on intercourse with strangers by Sir James Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), iii. 101 *et seq.*]

[4] M. Dobrizhoffer, *Historia de Abiponibus* (1784), i. 163.

[5] H. Laval, in *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi* (1837), x. 202.

of disease to their island.][1] D'Albertis was requested by the Alfoers opposite Ramoi to leave their village because his presence brought bad luck. "The people began to die," the natives complained to him, "as soon as you looked at us. Five have died in three days."[2] The Samoans fear evil influence from strangers. On entering a strange country the Maoris perform a ceremony to make it *noa*, as it may have been *tapu*, potentially dangerous.[3] When an Australian tribe approaches another that is unknown, they carry burning sticks "to purify the air."[4] [In San Salvador, writes Bentley, "there was much anxiety as to the effect of our presence in the country. There was a pretty general fear that death and disaster would follow,"[5] or that they would stop the rain and bring a drought.[6] While on other occasions, adds Mrs Bentley, "the natives insisted that the missionaries brought death and famine."[7] Sir Richard Burton collected evidence to demonstrate the fear and dislike of strangers, and instances the linguistic evidence of the "Hebrew Goyi (Gentile), the Hindu Mlenchla (mixed or impure breed), the Greek *βάρβαρος*, the Latin Barbarus, and the Chinese Fan Kwei (foreign devil)."[8]

From these typical examples we may proceed to others which show that] strange meats, such, for instance, as are non-indigenous, are feared, as by the Indians of Guiana, among whom they were rendered eatable by the *peaiman*,

[1] A. W. Murray, *Missions in Western Polynesia* (1863), pp. 360, 388.

[2] L. M. d'Albertis, *New Guinea* (1880), i. 53.

[3] E. Shortland, *Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders* (1854), p. 103.

[4] R. B. Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria* (1878), i. 134.

[5] W. H. Bentley, *Pioneering on the Congo* (1900), i. 137.

[6] *Ibid.*, i. 166.

[7] H. M. Bentley, *W. Holman Bentley . . . the Life and Labours of a Congo Pioneer* (1907), p. 212; cp. A. Bastian, *Ein Besuch in San Salvador* (1859), p. 104.

[8] Sir R. F. Burton, *The Captivity of Hans Stade* (1874), p. lxx.

but occasionally by an old woman blowing on them certain times, so as to expel the "spirit."[1] In German folklore there is the custom of blowing thrice into a strange spoon before eating with it.[2] The Indians of Guiana are afraid of the food of strangers, and of anything belonging to such strangers.[3] [Such fears are especially common in New Guinea. The Kiwai Papuans "fall dead" on eating unaccustomed food, on seeing fire for the first time, etc.[4] The Arabi River Papuans, though friendly, refused food offered to them by a white man.[5] Similarly the Sambigi Papuans, who live in an isolated spot 6000 ft. up, north-west of Mount Murray, refuse food to which they are not used.[6] The Managulasi Papuans have been observed to starve rather than cook their food in a new way.[7] A peculiarly interesting case, throwing light on more than one aspect of our problem, is that of the Northern Australians, who ascribe the existence of a half-caste child not to intercourse with a white person, but, they say, the child is pale because "too much we been eat em white man's flour."[8] To conclude with a case from Africa we have that of] the Zulus, who taboo all foods that are strange or unknown.[9] We may also compare the common belief that danger attaches to the first of any fruits or meats, as in the

[1] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *op. cit.*, p. 368.

[2] F. Panzer, *Beitrag zur Deutschen Mythologie* (1848), p. 257.

[3] W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana* (1868), p. 363.

[4] G. Landtman, "The Folk-Tales of the Kiwai Papuans," *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae* (1917), xlvii. 95; cp. *ibid.*, p. 551, *n.* 13.

[5] E. R. Oldham, in *Papua: Annual Report for . . . 1913-1914*, p. 89.

[6] Hon. M. S. C. Smith, "Kikori Expedition," *Papua: Annual Report for . . . 1911*, p. 170.

[7] A. E. Oelrichs, in *Papua: Report for . . . 1912*, p. 128.

[8] Sir W. B. Spencer, *Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia* (1914), pp. 25-26.

[9] D. Leslie, *Among the Zulus and Amatongas* (1875), p. 197.

ceremony of first-fruits amongst the Kaffirs[1] and many other peoples, such "holiness" as attaches thereto being undistinguished from any kind of potential danger.

A similar idea underlies the common diffidence about beginning an act or doing something for the first time or handselling a new object. Before shooting a cataract for the first time, or the first sight of any new place, striking rocks, etc., the Guiana Indian seeks to arrest the ill-will of the spirits. The dreaded objects are not mentioned, are not looked at more than is necessary, and artificial means of blinding the eyes, with pepper juice, are used to avoid the dreaded sight.[2] The Sandwich Islanders prayed before they ate, before tilling the ground, before building houses, launching boats and casting nets.[3] This kind of thing is world-wide, and a special group of these fears may be made of those associated with dwelling-places. In the Luang Sermata Islands enquiries are made as to whether a projected new house will be unlucky.[4] In the Babar Islands, before entering a new house offerings are thrown inside that the spirit, *Orlou*, may not make the inmates ill.[5] In the Sandwich Islands before the owner entered a new house the priest performed ceremonies and slept in it to prevent evil spirits resorting to it and to secure the inmates from the effect of malicious incantation.[6] Similar practices are found in Persia and in China.[7] Similarly, when an interval of disuse has elapsed, dwelling-houses become dangerous. Thus the

[1] J. Shooter, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-27.

[2] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *op. cit.*, p. 380.

[3] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), i. 350.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 318. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 343.

[6] W. Ellis, *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii* (1826), p. 293; *id.*, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), iv. 322.

[7] J. Pinkerton, *A General Collection of Voyages and Travels* (1808-1814), ix. 260; J. Doolittle, *op. cit.*, ii. 325.

Bashkirs on returning from their nomadic life of the summer to their winter quarters, approach these dwellings with reluctance, believing that *Sheitan* has taken up his abode there. The women therefore are sent forward first, armed with sticks, with which they strike the doors, uttering curses ; when the women have made their round, the men ride forward at full speed, with terrific shouts, to banish the dreaded demon from his hiding-place.[1]

[Turning now from primitive man's beliefs in this regard about his surroundings to those which he holds about himself and his fellows, we find precisely the same fears and supernatural ascriptions. We may proceed from emotion and pain to illness and death.] The Andamanese[2] and Maoris ascribe internal pains to evil spirits ; and amongst the latter people when a chief is in pain he is thereby accounted taboo.[3] Also, when a Maori warrior was afraid, the *tohunga* invoked a friendly spirit to repulse the evil spirit causing the fear.[4] It will be remembered that the Maori taboo implies that one is under the influence of the ancestral spirits ; and the apparent inconsistency that a Maori gentleman, who is always taboo, can become taboo at various crises, and, as will be seen later, can contract such taboo as to injure his inherent taboo, is quite natural and needs no explanation. Further, the Battas attribute not only diseases but also such phenomena as anger to evil spirits, which also, according to them, force men to do murder and to commit other crimes.[5] Such states as idiocy, hysteria and

[1] G. A. Erman, *Reise um die Erde* (1835-1841), i. 103.

[2] E. H. Man, "The Andamanese and Nicobarese Objects presented to Maj.-Gen. Pitt Rivers," *J.A.I.* (1882), xi. 284.

[3] E. Shortland, *Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders* (1854), p. 82 ; W. Yate, *An Account of New Zealand* (1835), p. 104.

[4] E. Shortland, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand* (1851), pp. 67-68.

[5] F. Junghuhn, *Die Battaländer auf Sumatra* (1847), ii. 156.

various forms of neurosis are, as is well known, explained by savages in the same way. We still have the phrase "an inspired idiot." Intoxication is similarly explained, also such apparently irregular conditions as ecstasy and enthusiasm. In the same way popular thought and language prove this to be so with love no less than with other periodic emotional crises. Both the Yoruba and the Ewe-speaking peoples attribute sexual desire to possession by the god of love, *Legba*.[1] It is very natural that savage ignorance should ascribe to possession by supernatural influences those strong impulses which carry a man away and render him for the moment a blind automaton. The very word "passion" preserves the primitive idea that such states are due to external agency: yet these facts limit still further primitive man's knowledge of himself. Again, in the case of normal, non-emotional functions, which are unusual in so far as they are only periodic, it is natural that danger from spiritual agencies should be thought of chiefly when the crisis is worse than usual. Thus in the Aru Islands it is at difficult labour that means are taken against evil spirits, by, for instance, the banging of drums;[2] so in the island of Wetar[3] and in the Ceramlaut Archipelago.[4] If labour is difficult the Chinese suppose it is due to an evil spirit that prevents the child's appearance;[5] and in the Philippines, when the birth is delayed, witches are supposed to be responsible and are driven away by exploding gunpowder from a mortar improvised out of a bamboo.[6] If the new-born child howls the Babar natives attribute it to the influence

[1] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1890), p. 41.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 265. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 449. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 175.

[5] J. Doolittle, *op. cit.*, i. 118.

[6] Sir J. Bowring, *A Visit to the Philippine Islands* (1859), p. 144.

of an evil spirit, and food is spread for it outside the house.[1] This case is somewhat surprising, but perhaps it is excessive squalling that is referred to. More naturally, if a Chinese child will not suck nor cry and appears lifeless, the belief is that it is exposed to evil influences.[2]

Again, there is an almost universal belief that sickness and death are unnatural and abnormal. These are strange conditions of which the savage cannot solve the mystery, [for in primitive thought, so far as we can analyse it, life and death are not the balanced opposites which civilised contemplation has made them. To early man life and health are the normal conditions, death and illness catastrophes, miraculous and terrible. In the case of sicknesses exceptions are generally made of those which occur frequently enough to be reckoned almost normal; and in the case of death an exception is often made when a man kills his quarry or foe; here the satisfaction of an end achieved inhibits the feelings aroused by the seemingly non-violent death of a tribesman. Thus, according to Australian philosophy men would live on indefinitely except for the result of actual physical violence or of sorcery, a refined form of it, or of the act of a supernatural being.[3] This is the usual view of the savage, and the great complexity of his views about the supernatural causes of death is not surprising, for, though apparently incapable of abstract views on life, vitality, as such, the constant rage which characterises his attitude towards death involves a permanent concern with the supposed causes of an event which, though he must confess it to be inevitable, remains a mystery and

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 354.

[2] J. Doolittle, *op. cit.*, i. 120.

[3] W. E. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queenslana Aborigines* (1897), p. 161.

a violation of natural law.[1] The attitude of the savage towards death may be not inaptly compared to that of Mr Shaw's "Ancients," who, doomed normally to an infinite life, pass their time in contemplation and in the fearless anticipation of a fatal accident.[2]

These generalisations may now be substantiated with a few typical cases. An observation about the Australian belief has already been quoted from Queensland]; amongst the Dieri and neighbouring tribes of South Australia, "no native contracts a disease or complaint from natural causes; the disease is supposed to be caused by some enemy." In any serious case the Koonkies or doctors are called in to beat "the devil" out of the camp. "This is done by the stuffed tail of a kangaroo, by beating the ground in and out of the camp, chasing him away for some distance."[3] The Kurnai could not conceive of death by disease. It was regarded as due to the magical influence of enemies or of evil spirits. Death, according to their ideas, could only occur through accident, open violence or secret magic.[4] Amongst the tribes of Central Australia "no such thing as natural death is realised by the native; a man who dies has of necessity been killed by some other man, or perhaps even by a woman, and sooner or later that man or woman will be attacked. However old or decrepit a man or woman may be when death takes place, it is at once supposed that it has been brought about by the magic

[1] This passage is based on one in A. E. Crawley, "Life and Death (Primitive)," *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (1915), viii. 9.

[2] G. B. Shaw, *Back to Methuselah* (1921), pp. 254, 257.

[3] S. Gason, "The Tribes, Dieyerie, Auminie, Yandrawontha, Yarawaurka, Pilladopa," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 170.

[4] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), pp. 251, 258.

influence of some enemy."[1] [A New Zealander who was ill refused remedies, the "deluded man said Atua was within him eating his vitals."[2] Dr Malinowski, who has lived among Melanesians almost as one of them and who has thus had exceptional opportunities for observing them, writes that health to the Melanesian is a natural state of affairs and that they ascribe illness and death principally to supernatural interference.[3] More specifically, in New Guinea natives "never believe in being sick from anything but spiritual causes, and that death, unless by murder, can take place from nothing but the wrath of the spirits."[4] The Kai Papuans declare that no one dies a natural death, all phenomena of this kind being due to witchcraft,[5] while the Bukaua, although they know and name many of the organs of the body, ascribe illness to spirits or to sorcery.[6] The natives of Keisar, one of the Moluccas, ascribe sickness to a malignant spirit, to the god of the sky or of the sun, or to the spirits of the dead whom they have failed to honour.[7] The curious diversity of views in this region is illustrated by the inhabitants of the other islands in the same group, Kola and Kobroor, who hold that death is due to the spirits of ancestors, who kill men in order to feed on their souls.][8] Almost all deaths, sicknesses and other calamities are attributed by the Andamanese to evil spirits.[9]

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 48, 476, 530; cp. *idd.*, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (1904), pp. 526 *et seq.*

[2] — Kendal, in *The Missionary Register* (1817), pp. 348-349.

[3] B. Malinowski, "Magic, Science and Religion," in *Science, Religion and Reality*, ed. by N. J. T. M. Needham (1925), p. 33.

[4] J. Chalmers, "Taoripi," *J.A.I.* (1898), xxvii. 329.

[5] C. Keysser, "Aus dem Leben der Kaileute," *in* R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu Guinea* (1911), iii. 140.

[6] S. Lehmer, "Bukaua," *in* R. Neuhauss, *op. cit.*, iii. 466.

[7] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 419. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[9] E. H. Man, *op. cit.*, xi. 288-289.

In Africa these beliefs are very general ; the Zulus believe no one to die a natural death except in battle or in a row.[1] Amongst the Basutos sickness is attributed to ill-wishers who bewitch one.[2] Among most Congo tribes death is seldom regarded in the light of a natural event.[3] [Thus in Lukolela, on the Upper Congo, one day a missionary "saw one of his workmen sitting in the cold wind on a rainy day. He advised his going home and changing his wet cloth for a dry one, but he [the native] said, "It does not matter. People do not die of a cold wind ; people only get ill and die from witchcraft." [4] From the same place a case is reported of the killing of a man by a crocodile, the man's death, in common with the destruction of poultry and the like, being ascribed to the operation of an evil spirit.[5] Similarly when a Bakongo chief was killed by an elephant the medicine-man had to settle whether the death was due to witch-craft or to the will of the Great Spirit.[6] Among the Baganda, west of Victoria Nyanza, there is no such thing as death from natural causes ; disease and death are caused by "ghosts," and are either merited or brought about by malicious invocation.[7] In Loango there was not even held to be such a thing as a fatal accident ; all such were caused by the sorcery of enemies.[8] We have an interesting account from a doctor of the belief of the natives of Sierra Leone, who "conceive that

[1] D. Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 48. [2] E. Casalis, *The Basutos* (1861), p. 277.

[3] H. Ward, "Ethnographical Notes Relating to the Congo Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 287.

[4] W. H. Bentley, *op. cit.*, ii. 247.

[5] E. J. Glave, *Six Years of Adventure in Congo-Land* (1893), p. 92.

[6] H. Ward, *Five Years with the Congo Cannibals* (1890), pp. 43-44.

[7] J. Roscoe, "Further Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Baganda," *J.A.I.* (1902), xxxii. 40.

[8] O. Dapper, *Naukeurige Beschrijvinge der Afrikaensche Gewesten* (1676), ii. 152-153.

no death is natural or accidental, but that the disease or the accident by which it is immediately caused, is the effect of supernatural agency. In some cases it is imagined that death is brought about by the malign agency of some individual, who employs witchcraft for that purpose : in other cases it is supposed that death is inflicted by the tutelar demon of some one on whom the deceased, when discovered and punished by the avenging hand of griffee, was practising incantations. It is most usual to assign the former cause for the sickness and death of chiefs, and other people of consequence, and their connections ; and the latter for any of those of the lower class."[1] Finally, before we leave this continent, may be quoted a specimen of the numerous myths invented to explain the abnormality of death, myths which are to be found in all parts of the world.] This interesting case, containing the idea of "death and his brother sleep," is the myth of the Yaos and Wayîsa of East Central Africa. They say that death is largely caused by wizards ; it was originally brought into the world by a woman, who taught two men to go to sleep. One day, while they slumbered, she held the nostrils of one of them, till his breath ceased and he died.[2]

[To the Lengua Indians of the Paraguyan Chaco anything in the nature of sickness or death is the result of a direct act of either evil spirits or of a distant wizard.[3] Among the Araucanos death, except in war but not excluding one resulting from a violent accident, is supposed to be caused by sorcery.[4] The Abipones

[1] T. Winterbottom, *An Account of the Native Africans in the Neighbourhood of Sierra Leone* (1803), i. 235-236 ; cp. F. J. Clozel *and* R. Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire* (1902), p. 363 ; J. Spieth, *Die Evhe Stämme* (1906), p. 255.

[2] J. Macdonald, "East-Central African Customs," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 111-112.

[3] W. B. Grubb, *An Unknown People in an Unknown Land* (1911), p. 161.

[4] R. E. Latcham, "Ethnology of the Araucanos," *J.A.I.* (1909), xxxix. 364.

thought themselves immortal but for witchcraft and the presence of the Spaniards,[1] though the latter clause was obviously a late addition. To the Cherokees disease and death are not natural but due to the evil influence of spirits, ghosts or witches.][2] The Navajos ascribe death to Chinde, "the devil," who remains in the vicinity of the dead. Those who perform the burial protect themselves from the evil influence by smearing their naked bodies with tar.[3] All illness and bodily evil in British Guiana is the work of spirits, occasionally supposed to act in human form, but generally not, "therefore disease is more common than assault by bodily foes."[4]

[In this brief survey of primitive man's ideas concerning the supernatural causes of death and disease, no attempt has been made to classify those ideas. To do so it will be necessary to distinguish the injuries caused by supernatural beings from those brought about by sorcery, and again from those in the first class but instigated by sorcery, and other subtler distinctions would be called for. To these distinctions and to their significance, we shall have to return.]

Thus if we survey the whole of human life and human relations, we find that all states in which there is danger to be apprehended or something unusual or unusually important to be done or suffered are taboo.

[1] M. Dobrizhoffer, *op. cit.*, ii. 92-93.

[2] J. Mooney, "The Sacred Formulas of the Cherokees," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1891), vii. 322; J. Haywood, *Natural and Aboriginal History of East Tennessee* (1823), pp. 267-268.

[3] H. C. Yarrow, "A Further Contribution to the Study of the Mortuary Customs of the North American Indians," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1881 for 1879-1880), i. 123.

[4] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *op. cit.*, p. 366.

We have considered those cases which all men experience ; in addition every one is taboo in time of war, at the arrival of strangers, at the planting of the new seed, and at other periodic performances, as Sir James Frazer has so amply demonstrated in his volume on *Taboo*. We shall also find later that occasions where the performance of bodily functions is in question are frequently taboo, and practically always when the functions are sexual or nutritive. We have also seen that even emotional states such as pain, anger, fear and love, are ascribed to supernatural agencies and are taboo states ; and at last the remarkable fact becomes clear that in primitive thought most of what a man or woman does is actually, and all is potentially taboo. It is not merely the incarnate god, the king and the priest, the sick and the mourner, the warrior and the hunter, the boy and the girl at puberty, the infant, the mother in child-bed, and the like, that are in this religious condition, but all human beings, as such, are potentially taboo, dangerous and in danger, all alike, as it were, kings and priests. This tendency arising from subjective conceptions as to the danger of acts and things unfamiliar, out of the routine or not understood, grows out of man's egoistic sensibility, that animal form of the instinct of self-preservation and the will to live, which causes the individual to insulate himself from potential danger. Such danger centres in particular upon the organs of sense and function, the mysterious and complex working of which produces in the thinking organism a subconscious impulse, in the ratio of their importance and complexity, towards their preservation and thereby the preservation of the individual himself. Thus subconscious impulse develops into ideas which are religious in their character and which in their turn suggest the

various methods of taboo. These ideas are religious in their content of "spiritual," as not distinguished from material, danger, and these dangers are conceived of materially and dealt with as such. In all these facts can also be seen between the lines the identity of the taboo state with the dangerous condition caused by evil spirits.

Turning now to the other side of these states, in which the person concerned is dangerous as well as in danger, we are told by Messrs Spencer and Gillen that they "were constantly impressed with the idea that one black fellow will often tell you that he can and does do something magical, whilst all the time he is perfectly well aware that he cannot, and yet firmly believes that some other man can really do it. In order that his fellows may not be considered in this respect as superior to himself, he is obliged to resort to what is really a fraud; but in course of time he may even come to loose sight of the fact that it is a fraud which he is practising upon himself and his fellows."[1] In short amongst savages it is not only professional sorcerers who possess magic power and influence, every man is supposed to have these more or less. For another instance from Australia, most of the old men are sorcerers, and are "able both to cause and cure disease, rain, wind, thunder and hail."[2]

Thus all persons are potentially dangerous to others, as well as potentially in danger, in virtue simply of the distinction between man and man. The individual *quâ* individual is potentially in danger from other individuals and dangerous to them. This egoistic sensibility and caution are intensified when things or persons present some unexplained strangeness, and we may conclude

[1] *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 130.

[2] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 359, 384.

that the mere fact of sexual differentiation is enough to form the basis of a similar religious caution between men and women. In the second place, functional crises are accentuated forms of this sexual differentiation, and their apparent abnormality causes uneasiness to the individual and to the other sex also. The following case sums up the argument; the Indians of Costa Rica believe that the ceremonial "uncleanness" called *bu-ku-ru* is very virulent. It is most dangerous from a woman in her first pregnancy. "She infects the whole neighbourhood, and all deaths are laid at her door." Also, "a place which has not been visited for a long time, or one approached for the first time, is infected with *bu-ku-ru*."[1] Here then we have an ultimate origin for the religious precautions used not only at birth, puberty and pregnancy, but at the entering upon a new relation, and that a sexual relation, such as marriage. [To sum up, the "argument is directed to show that all relations between human beings are regarded by primitive man as having an element of danger, and that this conception of danger is intensified whenever there is anything unusual or abnormal in the relation. This idea of danger becomes especially prominent in connection with physiological functions, and several factors concur to intensify it in the case of marriage."][2]

The whole series of phenomena, as may especially be seen in the ideas and practices concerned with things new and unusual, with the handselling of such, and with the entering upon strange or important acts and functions, illustrates well a characteristic of early man, which may

[1] W. M. Gabb, in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* (1875), p. 505.

[2] W. H. R. Rivers, in a review of the first edition of *The Mystic Rose, Man* (1902), ii. 78-79.

be described as diffidence, lack of initiative and incapacity for responsibility, and which is the general result of ignorance and of inexperience. This mental and moral habit has, as the material on which it works, the very ignorance with which it is associated in origin. Later, this interesting stage of human development will be shown to have developed moral ideas which have profoundly influenced the progress of man.

CHAPTER III

SEXUAL TABOO

"In the beginning, when Twashtri came to the creation of woman, he found that he had exhausted his materials in the making of man, and that no solid elements were left. In this dilemma, after profound meditation, he did as follows. He took the rotundity of the moon, and the curves of the creepers, and the clinging of tendrils, and the trembling of grass, and the slenderness of the reed, and the bloom of flowers, and the lightness of leaves, and the tapering of the elephant's trunk, and the glances of deer, and the clustering of rows of bees, and the joyous gaiety of sunbeams, and the weeping of clouds, and the fickleness of the winds, and the timidity of the hare, and the vanity of the peacock, and the softness of the parrot's bosom, and the hardness of adamant, and the sweetness of honey, and the cruelty of the tiger, and the warm glow of the fire, and the coldness of snow, and the chattering of jays, and the cooing of the *kókila*, and the hypocrisy of the crane, and the fidelity of the *chakrawáka;* and compounding all these together he made woman, and gave her to man. But after one week, man came to him, and said: Lord, this creature that you have given me makes my life miserable. She chatters incessantly, and teases me beyond endurance, never leaving me alone: and she requires incessant attention, and takes all my time up, and cries about nothing, and is always idle; and so I have come to give her back again, as I cannot live

with her. So Twashtri said : Very well : and he took her back. Then after another week, man came again to him, and said : Lord, I find that my life is very lonely since I gave you back that creature. I remember how she used to dance and sing to me, and look at me out of the corner of her eye, and play with me, and cling to me ; and her laughter was music, and she was beautiful to look at, and soft to touch : so give her back to me again. So Twashtri said : Very well : and gave her back again. Then after only three days, man came back to him again, and said : Lord, I know not how it is ; but after all, I have come to the conclusion that she is more of a trouble than a pleasure to me : so please take her back again. But Twashtri said : Out on you ! Be off ! I will have no more of this. You must manage how you can. The man said : But I cannot live with her. And Twashtri replied : Neither could you live without her. And he turned his back on man, and went on with his work. Then man said : What is to be done ! for I cannot live either with or without her."[1]

This extract from one of Mr F. W. Bain's picturesque tales, illustrates a conception of the relations of man and woman which often occurs in literature. The same conception, due ultimately to that difference of sex and of sexual characters which renders mutual sympathy and understanding more or less difficult, is characteristic of mankind in all periods and stages of culture. Woman is one of the last things to be understood by man. Though the complement of man and his partner in health and sickness, poverty and wealth, woman is different from man, and this difference has had the same religious results as have attended other things which man does not understand. The same thing is true of woman's attitude to

[1] F. W. Bain, *A Digit of the Moon* (1901), pp. 13-15.

man. In the history of the sexes there have always been at work the two complementary physical forces of attraction and repulsion ; man and woman may be regarded, and not fancifully, as the highest sphere in which this law of physics operates ; in love the two sexes are drawn to each other by an irresistible sympathy, while in other circumstances there is more or less of antipathy and segregation, due to and enforced by human ideas of human relations.

The remarkable facts which follow show the primitive theory and practice of this separation of the sexes. Both in origin and results the phenomena are those of taboo, and hence we have applied to these facts the specific term of Sexual Taboo. At first sight this early stage of the relations between men and women may cause surprise, but when one realises the continuity of human ideas and analyses one's own consciousness, at one level or another, one may find therein potentially the same conception, though perhaps emptied of its religious content.

[We may begin with cases showing this sexual separation as we find it expressed in regulations and taboos connected with houses, resting-places, and allied instances.] In the Sandwich Islands there were six houses connected with every great establishment ; one for worship, one for the men to eat in, another for the women, a dormitory, a house for *kapa*-beating, and one where at certain intervals the women might live in seclusion.[1] In general the female sex was isolated and humiliated by taboo, and in their domestic life the women lived almost entirely by themselves.[2] In the Marquesas Islands the place where the men congregate and spend most of their time is taboo to women and protected by the penalty

[1] J. J. Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands* (1843), p. 208.

[2] W. Ellis, *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii* (1826), p. 359.

of death from the imaginary pollution of a woman's presence; the chiefs never trouble about any domestic affairs.[1] [So strong is this feeling that a woman is forbidden to carry or even to touch a thing that has once been in contact with or hung over the head of her husband or father.[2] According to an earlier traveller the taboo appears to have been still stronger in Nukuhiva, an island in the north-western region of the Marquesas group. Here] if a woman happened to sit upon or even to pass near an object which had become taboo by contact with a man, it could never be used again and the woman was put to death.[3] In the same island the houses of important men are not accessible to their own wives, who live in separate huts.[4] In Tahiti and the Society Islands generally, a woman was isolated by sexual taboo; she had to respect those places frequented by men, and the head of a husband and father was "sacred" from the touch of a woman, nor might a wife or daughter touch any object that had been in contact with these tabooed heads or step over them when their owners were asleep.[5] In Rapa, one of the Tubuai or Austral Islands, all men are taboo to women.[6] No woman may enter the house of a Maori chief.[7] In Fiji, husbands are as frequently away from their wives as with them; it is not, in Fijian

[1] C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans* (1875-1876), ii. 370.

[2] M. Radiguet, *Les derniers sauvages* (1882), p. 156.

[3] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde* (1834-1835), i. 505.

[4] *Ibid.*, i. 504.

[5] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), i. 129; C. Letourneau, *La sociologie d'après l'ethnographie* (1880), p. 173.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 174.

[7] R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui* (1870), p. 165; E. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *J.A.I.* (1890), xix. 118; *id.*, *The Maori-Polynesian Comparative Dictionary* (1891), s.v. *Kahukahu*; E. Shortland, *Maori Religion and Mythology* (1882), p. 101; *id.*, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand* (1851), p. 295.

society, thought well for a man to sleep regularly at home.[1] Another account states that "it is quite against Fijian ideas of delicacy that a man ever remains under the same roof with his wife or wives at night." He may not take his night's repose anywhere except at one of the public *bures* of his town or village. The women and girls sleep at home. "*Rendezvous* between husband and wife are arranged in the depths of the forest, unknown to any but the two." All the male population, married and unmarried, sleep at the *bures*, or club-houses, of which there are generally two in each village. Boys till of age have a special one.[2] Another investigator states that women are not allowed to enter a *bure*, which is also used as a lounge by the chiefs.[3] In Uripiv of the New Hebrides there is a curious segregation of the sexes, beginning, at least in one respect, soon after a boy is born.[4] A peculiarity of conjugal life in New Caledonia is that men and women do not sleep under the same roof. The wife lives and sleeps by herself in a shed near the house. "You rarely see the men and women talking or sitting together. The women seem perfectly content with the companionship of their own sex. The men, who loiter about with spears in a most lazy fashion, are seldom seen in the society of the opposite sex."[5]

[The Australian is alarmed if a woman steps over him while he is asleep.[6] The Kurnai in south-eastern

[1] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 137.

[2] B. Seemann, *Viti* (1862), pp. 110, 191.

[3] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-42* (1845), iii. 97, 352.

[4] B. T. Somerville, "Notes on some Islands of the New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 4.

[5] J. Garnier, *Voyage autour du Monde, Océanie, les Iles des Pins, Loyalty et Tahiti* (1871), p. 186; J. W. Anderson, *Notes of Travel in Fiji and New Caledonia* (1880), p. 232.

[6] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), i. 50.

Victoria have separate camps for men and women.[1] The Euahlayi of north-west New South Wales have a special bachelors' camp.[2] And the Arunta and other tribes in the centre of the continent have a "special part of the main camp where the men assemble and near to which the women may not go."[3] Every inhabited island in the Torres Straits has a certain area set apart for men into which no woman might enter. This place is sometimes considered "sacred," as in the western islands.][4] In New Guinea the women sleep in houses apart, near those of their male relatives. The men assemble for conversation and meals in the *marea*, a large reception-house, which women are not allowed to enter. [West of Yule Island, off the south coast of New Guinea, the sexes are reported to have separate houses.[5] While in other districts there are communal houses, which, however, have end rooms set aside for men; women and children enter those houses by a side door.][6] In New Britain there are two large houses in each village, one for men, the other for women: neither sex may enter the house of the other.[7] In the Admiralty Islands there is a house reserved in each village for the use of women, both married and single, while

[1] A. W. Howitt, "The Jeraeil, or Initiation Ceremonies of the Kurnai Tribe," *J.A.I.* (1885), xiv. 318 *n.*

[2] K. L. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe* (1905), p. 61.

[3] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 656.

[4] A. C. Haddon, "Introduction," in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits* (1904), v. 3; A. C. Haddon, C. G. Seligmann *and* A. Wilkin, "Magic and Religion," in *ibid.*, v. 365-367.

[5] Sir W. MacGregor, *British New Guinea* (1897), p. 85.

[6] A. C. Haddon, "Studies in the Anthropogeography of British New Guinea," *The Geographical Journal* (1900), xvi. 421.

[7] W. Powell, *Wanderings in a Wild Country* (1883), p. 84.

the single men live together in a separate building.[1] A Solomon Islander will never pass under a tree fallen across the path, because a woman may have stepped over it before him.[2] After which it is not surprising to learn that in these islands women may not enter the men's taboo house, nor even cross the beach in front of it.[3] Of this racial area in general we have the observation that it is considered "degrading" for a Melanesian chief to go where women may be above his head: boys are forbidden to go beneath the women's bed-place.[4] In the Caroline Islands a chief's establishment has one house for the women, a second for eating and a third for sleeping.[5] In the Pelew Islands there is "a remarkable separation of the sexes." Men and women hardly live together and family life is impossible. The segregation is political as well as social.[6] In Ceram, women are forbidden to enter the men's club-house.[7] To a man of the Javanese island Bali *tête-à-tête* conversation with a woman is absolutely forbidden.[8]

In Cambodia a wife may never use the pillow or mattress of her husband, because "she would hurt his happiness thereby."[9] In Siam it is considered unlucky

[1] H. N. Moseley, "The Inhabitants of the Admiralty Islands," *J.A.I.* (1877), vi. 413.

[2] H. B. Guppy, *The Solomon Islands* (1887), i. 4. [3] *Ibid.*, i. 67.

[4] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (1891), p. 233.

[5] C. E. Meinicke, *op. cit.*, ii. 370.

[6] J. S. Kubary, "Die Palau-Inseln in der Südsee," *Journal des Museum Godeffroy* (1873-1874), i. 219, 230; *id.*, *Die socialen Einrichtungen der Palauer* (1885), pp. 33, 148; C. E. Meinicke, *op. cit.*, ii. 380; K. Semper, *Die Palau-Insein* (1873), pp. 318-319, 366.

[7] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 110.

[8] F. Junghuhn, *Die Battaländer auf Sumatra* (1847), ii. 340.

[9] E. Aymonier, "Note sur les coutumes et croyances superstitieuses des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine Française* (1883), vi. 162.

to pass under a woman's clothes hung out to dry,[1] but the interpretation of the custom by which the wife has a lower pillow than her husband, as a sign "to remind her of her inferiority,"[2] is probably late. Among the Karens of Burma going under a house where there are females within is avoided,[3] and in Burma generally it is thought an "indignity" to have a woman above the head—to prevent which the houses are never built with more than one storey.[4] But this explanation of an architectural peculiarity is doubtless *ex post facto*. Amongst the people of Rajmahal, in Bengal, if a man be detected by a woman sitting on her cot and she complains of the impropriety, he pays her a fowl as a fine, which she returns; on the other hand, if a man detects a woman sitting on his cot, he kills the fowl which she produces in answer to his complaint, and sprinkles the blood on the cot to purify it, after which she is pardoned.[5] [In "a high-class Hindu family, it is not customary for the husband and wife to sit together during leisure, to drive together, or to take their 'tea' together."][6] In Seoul, the capital of Korea, "they have a curious curfew law called *pem-ya*. A large bell is tolled at about 8 p.m. and 3 a.m. daily, and between those hours only women are supposed to appear in the streets. In the old days men found in the streets during the hours allotted to women were severely punished, but the rule has been

[1] A. Bastian, *Die Voelker des oestlichen Asien* (1866-1871), iii. 230.

[2] J. Pinkerton, *A General Collection of Voyages and Travels* (1808-1814), ix. 585.

[3] E. B. Cross, "The Karens," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1854), iv. 312.

[4] A. Bastian, *op. cit.*, ii. 150.

[5] T. Shaw, "The Inhabitants of the Hills near Rájmahall," *Asiatick Researches* (1795), iv. 88.

[6] B. A. Gupte, *A Prabhu Marriage* (1911), p. 2.

greatly relaxed of late years."[1] Apart from this rule "family life, as we have it, is utterly unknown in Korea."[2] Amongst the Samoyeds and Ostyaks a wife may not tread in any part of the tent except her own corner; after pitching the tent she must fumigate it before the men enter.[3] Among the former people whatever a woman steps over is unclean and has similarly to be fumigated.[4]

[The Thomson Indians of the interior of British Columbia have a special lodge in which they live when on a hunting-expedition; when a party of hunters are in occupation of such a lodge they are handed their meat through a hole in the back of it, because the door is used by women. Some of the hunters, indeed, eat only such food as has been cooked by an old woman.][5] The Ojebway Peter Jones thus writes of his own people: "I have scarcely ever seen anything like social intercourse between husband and wife, and it is remarkable that the women say little in the presence of the men."[6] The Shastika Indians of California have a town-lodge for men and another for women.[7] Other Californian tribes possess the former institution, which women may not enter.[8] According to another account of the Indians of this region, a man never enters his wife's wigwam

[1] H. B. Saunderson, "Notes on Corea and its People," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 305.

[2] *Ibid.*, xxiv. 306.

[3] J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie* (1736), pp. 15, 137.

[4] P. von Stenin, "Das Gewohnheitsrecht der Samojeden," *Globus* (1891), lx. 173.

[5] J. Teit, "The Thompson Indians of British Columbia," *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition* (1898-1900), i. 347-348.

[6] P. Jones, *History of the Ojebway Indians* (1861), p. 60.

[7] S. Powers, *The Tribes of California* (1877), p. 244.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

except under cover of darkness.[1] [When an Indian of the Gulf tribes is in his house, "it is death for a female to presume to enter the door, or approach within its pale."][2] The centre of Bororó life is the *Baitó*, the men's house, where all the men really live; the family huts are nothing more than a residence for the women and children. Amongst the Bakairí and the Schingú tribes generally in Brazil, women may never enter the men's club-house, where the men spend most of their time.[3]

Observers have noted "the haughty contempt" shown by Zulus for their wives. Men and women are rarely seen together; if a man and his wife are going to the same place, they do not walk together.[4] [When a woman steps over a sleeping man's legs among the South African Bantus, he thinks that he will be unable to run.[5] Amongst the Barea of East Africa man and wife seldom share a bed, the reason they give being that if they sleep together the breath of the wife will render her husband weak.[6] Husband and wife among the Kaffa in the same part of Africa see each other only at night, never meeting during the day. She is secluded in the interior portion of the house, while he occupies the remainder. "A public resort is also set apart for the husband, where no woman is permitted to appear. A penalty of three years' imprisonment attaches to an infringement of this rule."[7] In Senegambia the negro

[1] J. F. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages ameriquains* (1724), i. 576.

[2] W. Bartram, *Travels through North and South Carolina* (1791), p. 448.

[3] K. von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens* (1894), p. 480.

[4] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1859), pp. 81-82.

[5] H. A. Junod, "Les conceptions physiologiques des Bantou Sud-Africains et eurs Tabous," *Revue d'Ethnographie et de Sociologie* (1910), i. 138 *n*[3].

[6] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien* (1864), p. 526.

[7] J. L. Krapf, *Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours during an Eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa* (1860), p. 58.

women live by themselves, rarely with their husbands, and their sex is virtually a clique.][1] Amongst the Nubians each family has two dwelling-houses, one for the males and the other for the females.[2]

In this survey a complementary result of this separation of the sexes, namely, the solidarity of sex, has already emerged, and other instances will occur in various connections. It is practically universal in all stages of culture, even the highest. [In Australia there always exists a strong feeling of brotherhood between the males of a tribe.][3] Sexual solidarity is well brought out by the instance of the Tasmanians, amongst whom, if a wife was struck by her husband, the whole female population would come out and bring the "rattle of their tongues to bear upon the brute."[4] [Among the Onas of Tierra del Fuego the men consider the women social inferiors. "The tie between brother and brother, man and man, is with the Onas far more binding than that between the opposite sexes."][5] Amongst the Gauchos of Uruguay, women show a marked tendency to huddle together.[6] When ill-treated the Kaffir wife can claim an asylum with her father till her husband has made atonement. "Nor would many European husbands like to be subjected to the usual discipline on such occasions. The offending husband must go in person to ask for his wife. He is instantly surrounded

[1] L. J. B. Bérenger-Féraud, *Les peuplades de la Sénégambie* (1879), p. 373.

[2] [Count d'Escayrac de Lauture, *Le Désert et le Soudan* (1853), pp. 193 *et seq.*]

[3] E. M. Curr, *op. cit.*, i. 62.

[4] J. Bonwick, *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians* (1870), p. 73.

[5] W. S. Barclay, "Life in Tierra del Fuego," *The Nineteenth Century* (1904), lv. 100.

[6] D. Christison, "The Gauchos of San Jorge, Central Urugay," *J.A.I.* (1882), xi. 43.

by the women of the place, who cover him at once with reproaches and blows. Their nails and fists may be used with impunity, for it is the day of female vengeance, and the belaboured delinquent is not allowed to resist. He is not permitted to see his wife, but is sent home, with an intimation of what cattle are expected from him, which he must send before he can demand his wife again."[1] In eastern Africa, amongst the Kunama, the wife has an agent who protects her against her husband and fines him for ill-treatment. She possesses considerable authority in the house, and is on equal terms with her husband.[2] Amongst the Beni-Amer, women enjoy considerable independence. To obtain marital privileges, the husband has to make his wife a present of value. He must do the same for every harsh word he uses, and is often kept a whole night out of doors in the rain until he pays. The women have a strong esprit de corps; when a wife is ill-treated the other women come in to help her; it goes without saying that the husband is always in the wrong. The women express much contempt for the men, and it is considered disgraceful in a woman to show love for her husband.[3]

These examples show the lengths to which this segregation is sometimes carried. This is well brought out in examples of club-life, and there is here a close parallel to be found, not merely humorous, in the institution and etiquette of the modern club. The same biological tendency is behind both the modern and the primitive institution, though the later one is no longer supported by religious ideas. Again, certain of the above cases show incidentally how sexual differentiation often develops into real antagonism. The attempts of

[1] J. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (1858), p. 53.
[2] W. Munzinger, *op. cit.*, p. 387. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 324-325.

the Indians of California to keep their women in check,[1] show how the latter were struggling up to equality. The Pomo Indians of this region "find it very difficult to maintain authority over their women." A husband often terrifies his wife into submission by personating an ogre; after this she is usually tractable for some days.[2] Amongst the Tatu Indians of California the men have a secret society which gives periodic dramatic performances with the object of keeping the women in order. The chief actor, disguised as a devil, charges about among the assembled squaws.[3] The Gualala and Patwin Indians have similar dances performed by the assembled men to show the women the necessity of obedience.[4] The Fuegians celebrate a festival, *Kina*, in commemoration of their revolt against the women, "who formerly had the authority, and possessed the secrets of sorcery."[5] The Miris of Bengal will not allow their women to eat tiger's flesh, lest it should make them too strong-minded.[6] In the Dieri tribe of South Australia men threaten their wives, should they do anything wrong, with the "bone," the instrument of sorcery, which, when pointed at the victim, causes death; "this produces such dread among the women, that mostly instead of having a salutary effect, it causes them to hate their husbands."[7] In Africa also the anxious attempts of the men to keep the women down have been noted.[8] The adult males in South Guinea have a secret association, *Nda*, whose object is to keep the women, children and slaves in

[1] S. Powers, *op. cit.*, p. 406.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 154, 161.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 141.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 193, 224.
[5] A. Giraud-Teulon, *Les origines du mariage et de la famille* (1884), p. 448.
[6] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (1872), p. 33.
[7] S. Gason, "The Manners and Customs of the Dieyerie Tribe of Australian Aborigines," in *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (1879), p. 276.
[8] A. Bastian, *Ein Besuch in San Salvador* (18), 59p. 182.

order.[1] Amongst the Wataveta fire-making is not revealed to women, "because," say the men, "they would then become our masters."[2] The *Mumbo-Jumbo* of the Mandingos is well known. The performer who represents Mumbo-Jumbo has also the duty of keeping the sexes apart for the forty days after circumcision.[3] Other instances of associations to keep women in subjection are the *Egbo* in Old Calabar[4] and the west coast generally, where are also found the *Purro* and *Semo*,[5] the *Oro* in Yoruba[6] and the *Bundu* in Sierra Leone.[7] Women in their turn form such organisations amongst themselves, in which, for instance, they discuss their wrongs and form plans of revenge. Mpongwe women have an institution of this kind which is really feared by the men.[8] Similarly amongst the Bakalais and other African tribes.[9]

The way in which each sex is self-centred is also illustrated by the natural practice that women worship female, and men male deities. This needs no illustration, but a very instructive case may be quoted which comes from ancient Roman life. When husband and wife quarrelled they visited the shrine of the goddess *Viriplaca*

[1] J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa* (1856), p. 396.

[2] Sir H. H. Johnston, "The People of Eastern Equatorial Africa," *J.A.I.* (1886), xv. 10.

[3] [C. P. Coste d'Arnobat], *Voyage au pays de Bambouc* (1789), pp. 48-49.

[4] J. B. Walker, "Notes on the Politics, Religion, and Commerce of Old Calabar," *J.A.I.* (1877), vi. 120-122.

[5] A. Bastian, *Ein Besuch in San Salvador* (1859), p. 179. [6] *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*

[7] T. Winterbottom, *An Account of the Native Africans in the Neighbourhood of Sierra Leone* (1803), i. 185.

[8] A. Bastian, *op. cit.*, p. 180; *id.*, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (1860), iii. 294; *id.*, *Die deutsche Expedition an die Loanga-Küste* (1874-1875), ii. 24; J. L. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 397.

[9] P. B. Du Chaillu, *Exploration and Adventures in Equatorial Africa* (1861), p. 296.

on the Palatine. After opening their hearts in confession, they would return in harmony. This "appeaser of the male sex" was regarded as *domesticae pacis custos*.[1] Similarly, Bakalai women have a tutelar spirit which protects them against their male enemies and avenges their wrongs.[2] According to the Greenlanders, the moon is a male spirit and the sun a female one; the former rejoices in the death of women, while the latter has her revenge in the death of men. All males, therefore, keep within doors during an eclipse of the sun, and all females during an eclipse of the moon.[3] In the Pelew Islands the *kalids* of men are quiet and gentlemanly; it is those of women that make disturbances and inflict disease and death on members of the family.[4]

The same hostility makes use of the system of sex-totems [or patrons, which is found almost exclusively in Australia.][5] In Port Lincoln a small kind of lizard, the male of which is called *Ibirri*, and the female *Waka*, is said to have divided the sexes in the human species, "an event which would appear not to be much approved of by the natives, since either sex has a mortal hatred against the opposite sex of those little animals, the men always destroying the *Waka* and the women the *Ibirri*."[6] In the Wotjobaluk tribe, it is believed that the "life of *Ngununggunut* (the bat) is the life of a man, and the life of *Yartatgurk* (the nightjar) is the life of a woman"; when one of these is killed, a man or a woman dies.

[1] Valerius Maximus, *De Factis Dictisque Memorabilibus*, ii. 16.

[2] P. B. Du Chaillu, *loc. cit.*

[3] D. Granz, *The History of Greenland* (1820), i. 213.

[4] J. Kubary, ["Die Religion der Pelauer"], *in* A. Bastian, *Allerlei aus Volks- und Menschenkunde* (1888), i. 22.

[5] But see Sir J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy* (1910), ii. 627.

[6] C. W. Schürmann, "The Aboriginal Tribes of Port Lincoln in South Australia," in *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (1879), p. 241.

Should therefore either of these animals be killed, every man and woman fears that he or she may be the victim ; and this gives rise to numerous fights. "In these fights, men on one side, and women on the other, it was not at all certain who would be victorious, for at times the women gave the men a severe drubbing with their yam-sticks, while often the women were injured or killed by spears."[1] In the tribes of south-western Victoria "the common bat belongs to the men, who protect it against injury, even to the half-killing of their wives for its sake. The fern owl, or large goatsucker, belongs to the women, and, although a bird of evil omen, creating terror at night by its cry, it is jealously protected by them. If a man kills one, they are as much enraged as if it was one of their children, and will strike him with their long poles." The *mantis* also belongs to the men and no woman dares kill it.[2] [Closely similar beliefs are found amongst the Ta-tathi of New South Wales ; here also the men reverence the bat and never kill it. When women occasionally did so a great disturbance ensued, in which the women were sometimes wounded. Similarly, again, the animal reverenced by the women is a species of small owl, and if the men tried to kill one of these they, in their turn, were attacked by the women.[3] Every Kurnai had not only his own personal totem, but all the men jointly had the emu-wren as their sex totem, and all the women jointly similarly had the superb warbler. When men and women quarrelled, the latter would kill an emu-wren to

[1] A. W. Howitt, "Further Notes on the Australian Class Systems," *J.A.I.* (1889), xviii. 57-58 ; cp. *id.*, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (1904), pp. 148-151.

[2] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1881), pp. 52-53.

[3] A. L. P. Cameron, "Notes on some Tribes of New South Wales," *J.A.I.* (1885), xiv. 350.

spite the men. When they returned to the camp with the dead animal, the men attacked them and a fierce fight was the result. Sometimes the circumstances were reversed and the men gave the provocation.[1] These sex totems are "thought to be friendly to the sex they are akin to, and are protected by it";[2] they are also found amongst the Yuin of south-east Australia.][3]

Again women are more often than not either entirely excluded from the religious worship of the community, or only permitted on sufferance, and the same applies to festivals, feasts and the like. [This is found not only among the archaic civilisations but even at the present time.] Thus, where the prohibition is not needed to be carried out rigidly, the ideas which underlie these customs are satisfied by separating the sexes, as is still the case in many Roman Catholic churches [and in all Jewish Synagogues except those of the recently inaugurated "Liberal" movement]. The Arabs of Mecca will not allow women religious instruction, because "it would bring them too near their masters." According to some theologians of Islam, they have no place in Paradise.[4] If a Hindu woman touches an image, its divinity is thereby destroyed and it must be thrown away.[5] [In ancient Greece, women were excluded from the temple of Aphrodite Ἀχραία in Cyprus, from the temple and grove of Ares in Laconia, from the shrine

[1] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), pp. 201-202; A. W. Howitt, "Further Notes on the Australian Class Systems," *J.A.I.* (1889), xviii. 56-57.

[2] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (1904), p. 151.

[3] A. W. Howitt, "The Migrations of the Kurnai Ancestors," *J.A.I.* (1886), xv. 416; *id.*, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (1904), p. 150.

[4] C. Letourneau, *La sociologie d'après l'ethnographie* (1880), p. 180.

[5] W. Ward, *A View of the History, Literature, and Religion of the Hindoos* (1817-1820), ii. 13.

of the Anakes at Elatea, from the oracle of Apollo at Delphi (though here there was of course an exception for the pythoness), from the temple of the Ephesian Artemis, from the temple and grove of Ἔννοστος (a corn-hero at Tanagra), from the temple of the misogynistic Heracles in Phokis (while only a Thracian woman was permitted in the temple of Heracles at Erythrae and in that of the Tyrian Heracles at Gades), from the temple of Kronos, from the Prytaneum at Naukratis, from Poseidon's cult at Mykonas, and from the cave of Rhea on mount Lykaeon.][1]

Much the same phenomena are found among the uncivilised races. In the Sandwich Islands, women were not allowed to share in worship or festivals, and their touch "polluted" offerings to the gods.[2] In the Marquesas Islands the *hoolah-hoolah* ground, where festivals are held, is taboo to women, who are killed if they enter it or if they even touch with their feet the shadow of its trees.[3] The sexes never mingle together at the dances in the Hervey Islands.[4] In Tonga,[5] in the Gilbert and Marshall Islands,[6] and in Fiji, women are excluded from all worships: in the last place the women are apparently considered even more dangerous than dogs, for, while these are kept out of some temples, women are excluded from them all.[7] In New Britain

[1] L. R. Farnell, "Sociological Hypotheses Concerning the Position of Women in Ancient Religion," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* (1904), vii. 76-77.

[2] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), i. 129; C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans* (1875-1876), ii. 300.

[3] H. Melville, *Narrative of a Four Months' Residence among the Natives of a Valley of the Marquesas Islands* (1846), p. 100.

[4] W. W. Gill, *Life in the Southern Isles* [1876], p. 65.

[5] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 321.

[6] C. E. Meinicke, *op. cit.*, ii. 338.

[7] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *op. cit.*, i. 232, 238.

women are not allowed to be present at the festivals, and when men are talking of things which women may not hear, the latter must leave the hut.[1] In New Ireland, women may not enter the temples.[2] The Australians are very jealous lest women or strangers should intrude upon their sacred mysteries : it is death for a woman to look into a *bora*.[3] On the east of the Gulf of Papua, women are not allowed to approach the temple.[4] Amongst the Nufoers of New Guinea, men and women are separated on the occasions of dances.[5]

The women of the hill tribes near Rajmahal may not sacrifice nor appear at shrines nor take part in religious festivals.[6] Amongst the Todas, women may not approach the *tiriêri*, where the sacred cattle are kept, nor the sacred *palâls*.[7] Amongst the Chuvashes, women dare not assist at sacrifices.[8] [Samoyed women are not allowed to enter the holy places.][9] At entertainments of every kind amongst the Greenlanders, men and women sit apart.[10] Amongst the Ahts, women are never invited to the great feasts.[11] Amongst the Aleuts, the women have dances from which the men are excluded,

[1] R. Parkinson, *Im Bismarck-Archipelago* (1887), p. 300; H. H. Romilly, *The Western Pacific and New Guinea* (1887), p. 29.

[2] H. H. Romilly, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

[3] W. Ridley, "Report on Australian Languages and Traditions," *J.A.I.* (1873), ii. 271.

[4] J. Chalmers *and* W. W. Gill, *Work and Adventure in New Guinea* (1885), pp. 140, 150.

[5] J. B. von Hasselt, "*Die Nveforezen* [*sic* for Noeforezen]," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1876), viii. 186.

[6] T. Shaw, "The Inhabitants of the Hills near Rájamahall," *Asiatick Researches* (1795), iv. 51, 101.

[7] W. E. Marshall, *A Phrenologist amongst the Todas* (1873), p. 137.

[8] P. S. Pallas, *Voyages en Sibérie* (1791), i. 135.

[9] P. von Stenin, "Das Gewohnheitsrecht der Samojeden," *Globus* (1891), lx. 173.

[10] D. Cranz, *The History of Greenland* (1820), i. 158.

[11] G. M. Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life* (1868), p. 60.

and the men have their dances from which they exclude women. It is regarded as a fatal mischance to see on these occasions one of the opposite sex.[1] In Africa, Bayeye women may not enter the place of sacrifice, though this is the centre of tribal life.[2] Amongst the Gallas, women may not go near the sacred *woda*-tree where worship is celebrated.[3]

We may now proceed to the evidence drawn from the respective occupations of the two sexes, evidence which throws further light upon sexual taboo. Sexual differentiation in primary and secondary sexual characters necessitates some difference of occupation, and the religious ideas of primitive man have emphasised the biological separation. [A school of American anthropologists[4] have developed this suggestion into a full-dress theory in explanation of the phenomena of sexual taboo, which they hold to be exclusively due to the primitive biological and functional differentiation in the occupations of the sexes which has just been noted. This is of course an important factor and due allowance must be made for it in interpreting the evidence here brought together. But we believe that this evidence shows of itself the absurdity of ascribing the phenomena which we are discussing to any single cause, and that, in the present connection, a cause which excludes all the supremely important magico-religious elements.][5]

[1] W. H. Dall, *Ataska and its Resources* (1870), p. 389; H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America* (1875-1876), iii. 145.

[2] — Edwards, "Tradition of the Bayeye," *Folk-Lore Journal* (Cape Town, 1880), ii. 36.

[3] Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), iii. 56.

[4] *E.g.*, E. S. Ames, *The Psychology of Religious Experience* (1910), pp. 54, 64.

[5] Cp. E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), i. 636.

This occupational evidence must now be briefly surveyed. Amongst the North American Indians, custom and superstition ordain that the wife must carefully keep away from all that belongs to her husband's sphere of action.[1] [On the other hand, amongst the Dakotas "the men do not often interfere with the work of the women, neither will they help them if they can avoid it, for fear of being laughed at and called a woman."][2] In Nicaragua all the marketing was done by women. A man might not enter the market or even see the proceedings at the risk of a beating.[3] In British Guiana, cooking is the province of the women; on one occasion when the men were perforce compelled to bake, they were only persuaded to do so with the utmost difficulty, and were ever after pointed at as old women.[4] Exactly the same feelings subsist in the highest civilisations. In the same region, on the other hand, no women may go near the hut where *ourali* is made.[5] [The Orinoco Indians said to a missionary: "When the women plant maize the stalk produces two or three ears; when they set the manioc the plant produces two or three baskets of roots; and thus everything is multiplied. Why? Because women know how to produce children, and know how to plant the corn so as to ensure its germinating. Then, let them plant it; we do not know so much as they do."][6] An Eskimo thinks it an indignity to row in an *umiak*, the large boat

[1] T. Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* (1859-1872), iii. 100.

[2] P. Prescott, "The Dacotahs or Sioux of the Upper Mississippi," *in* M. R. Schoolcraft, *Historical and Statistical Information* (1851-1860), iii. 235.

[3] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America* (1875-1876), iii. 145.

[4] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana* (1883), p. 256.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 311.

[6] J. Gumilla, *El Orinoco illustrado* (1745), ii. 274-275.

used by women. The different offices of husband and wife are also very clearly distinguished ; for example, when he has brought his booty to land, it would be a stigma on his character, if he so much as drew a seal ashore, and, generally, it is regarded as scandalous for a man to interfere with what is the work of women.[1]

In the Marquesas Islands the use of canoes is prohibited to the female sex by taboo ; the breaking of the rule is punished with death.[2] Conversely, amongst the same people *tapa*-making belongs exclusively to women ; when they are making it for their own head-dresses it is taboo for men to touch it.[3] In Tahiti, a woman had to respect the weapons and fishing implements of the men.[4] In New Caledonia it is considered *infra dig.* for the men to perform manual labour, at any rate in the neighbourhood of the settlement ; such work is done by women only.[5] [On the other side, it endangers a canoe if a woman merely steps over its cable, and certainly if she is a passenger in one for any long journey.][6] In Samoa, where the manufacture of cloth is allotted solely to the women, it is a degredation for a man to engage in any detail of the process.[7] [The natives of Maryborough in Queensland throw away their fishing-lines and the like if a woman has but stepped over them.][8] The Andaman Islanders, in the Bay of Bengal, consider it beneath the

[1] F. Nansen, *The First Crossing of Greenland* (1890), ii. 313 ; D. Cranz, *The History of Greenland* (1820), i. 138, 154.

[2] H. Melville, *Narrative of a Four Months' Residence among the Natives of a Valley of the Marquesas Islands* (1846), p. 13.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 245.

[4] C. Letourneau, *La sociologie d'après l'ethnographie* (1880), p. 173.

[5] J. W. Anderson, *Notes of Travel in Fiji and New Caledonia* (1880), p. 231.

[6] — Lambert, *Moeurs et superstitions des Néo-Calédoniens* (1900), pp. 192-193.

[7] W. T. Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences* (1866), p. 131.

[8] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (1904), p. 402.

dignity of the men to perform those duties which belong to women only.[1] [Malagasy porters believe that if a woman steps over their poles, their skin will peal off next time they use these poles.[2] A. van Gennep, describes the various tools which it is taboo for a woman to touch in Madagascar.[3] If a Baganda woman steps over a weapon, it must be purified before it will aim straight again and kill.][4] The Bechuanas never allow women to touch their cattle, and accordingly the men have to plough themselves.[5] So amongst the Kaffirs, "because of some superstition."[6] [In south-eastern Africa "a woman must not enter the cattle-fold."[7] In Africa generally it is believed that the cattle get ill if women have anything to do with them.[8] Hence in most of the tribes milking is only permitted to men.[9] "Among the Beni-Ahsen tribe in Morocco," writes Dr Westermarck, "the women of the village where I was staying were quite horrified when one of my native servants set out to fetch water; they would on no account allow him to do what they said was a woman's business."[10] In Abyssinia, "it is infamy for a man to go to market to buy anything. He cannot carry water or bake bread; but he must wash the clothes belonging to both sexes, and, in this function, the women cannot

[1] E. H. Man, "The Andamanese and Nicobarese Objects presented to Maj.-Gen. Pitt Rivers," *J.A.I.* (1882), xi. 286.

[2] J. Sibree, *Madagascar and its People* [1870], p. 288.

[3] A. van Gennep, *Tabou et totémisme à Madagascar* (1904), pp. 154 *et seq.*

[4] J. Roscoe, "Further Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Baganda," *J.A.I.* (1902), xxxii. 59.

[5] E. Holub, "The Central South African Tribes," *J.A.I* (1881), x. 11.

[6] H. L. Roth, "The Origin of Agriculture," *J.A.I.* (1887), xvi. 119.

[7] J. Macdonald, *Light in Africa* (1890), p. 221.

[8] H. Schurtz, *Das afrikanische Gewerbe* (1900), p. 10.

[9] F. Ratzel, *Völkerkunde* (1885-1888), ii. 419.

[10] E. Westermarck, *op. cit.*, i. 636.

help him."[1] But undoubtedly the most characteristic form which this occupational taboo takes on is without doubt, to return to South Africa, that of the tribes in this region, who believe that, if a wife steps over her husband he will fail in war and if over his assegais, walking-sticks, or the like, these are spoiled and are given to the boys.[2]

This brings us to a very important part of our survey.] The chief occupations of the male in those stages of culture with which we have principally to deal are hunting and war. The supreme importance of these occasions has been referred to above, and is expressed by such terms as the Polynesian taboo. These terms generally imply rules and precautions intended to secure the safety and success of the warrior or hunter, and which form sometimes a sort of system of "training." Among these regulations the most constant is that which prohibits every kind of intercourse with the female sex.[3] [Thus the Israelite warrior was not only required to abstain from women,[4] but he was obliged to purify himself before returning to the camp if he had so much as a nocturnal emission.[5] The practice persisted among the Arabs, and was not obsolete in the second century of Islam.][6]

In New Zealand a man who has important business on hand, either in peace or war, is taboo and must keep

[1] J. Bruce, *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile* (1790), iv. 474.

[2] J. Macdonald, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

[3] [Dr Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1908), iii. 210, considers that this prohibition "bears witness to the weakness of the sexual impulse," among savages. This consideration opens up very wide questions, which have been discussed by Mr Crawley, "Chastity (Introductory)," *E.R.E.* (1910), iii. 474-490.]

[4] 1 Samuel, xxi. 5. [5] Deuteronomy, xxiii. 9-11.

[6] W. R. Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (1894), pp. 454-455.

from women. On a war party, the Maoris are taboo "an inch thick" and may not go near their wives until the fighting is over and peace proclaimed.[1] [The Fijians practise a sort of Theban comradeship-in-arms, and abstinence from women is a rule of warriors.[2] The Moánus of the Admiralty Islands must observe continence for five days before he goes fishing with large nets, for two or three days before he goes to war, and for two days before he enters the bachelors' part of the men's house.[3] Before the departure of an expedition the Trobrianders abstain from their wives for two days.[4] The Motumotu of Freshwater Bay in New Guinea have to observe continence before hunting, fishing or warlike expeditions],[5] for they are then *helega*, and if they do not observe this prohibition they will have no success.[6] In south-east New Guinea, similarly, men are taboo for some days before fighting and are not allowed to see or approach any women.[7] [The Kei Islanders practise continence before war and those who remain at home have to remain continent during the progress of the fighting.[8] The Halmaharese are continent during the progress of a war, believing that connection with women is enervating.[9] The Babars, to whom cock-fighting was introduced by the Malays of Kutei, make these fights into regular wars. During Dr Niewenhuis's journey in

[1] E. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *J.A.I.* (1890), xix. 110-111; [E. F. Maning, *Old New Zealand* (1863), pp. 96, 114; E. Dieffenbach, *Travels in New Zealand* (1843), ii. 85-86; R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui* (1870), p. 189].

[2] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 45.

[3] R. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee* (1907), p. 395.

[4] B. Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (1922), p. 198.

[5] J. Chalmers, "Toaripi," *J.A.I.* (1898), xxvii. 327.

[6] *Id.*, *Pioneering in New Guinea* (1887), p. 186. [7] *Ibid.*, p. 65.

[8] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 223.

[9] *Id.*, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 69.

Borneo in 1897, Kwing Irang, a great cock-fighter, was strongly opposed to women accompanying the expedition, since they would have a bad influence on his precious cocks. Nevertheless a woman came and Kwing Irang kept his cocks as far away from her as was possible. The strength of these birds, as well as that of men, suffered from contact with women. When some one stood on an article worn by a woman Kwing Irang told him not to touch it unless he wanted to become weak and not to succeed in hunting, fishing and war.[1] In Noessa Laut, it is believed that invulnerability in war results from sexual abstinence.[2] Malays in general follow the same rule; it is believed that the bullets of those who break it lose their power;[3] similarly they have a seven days' obligatory period of continence during the fishing season.[4] In Assam "warriors, both before and after a raid, may not cohabit with their wives, and may not eat food cooked by a woman. Indeed, so strong is the *genna* [taboo] against any intercourse with women, that on one occasion a woman, the wife of the headman, who was quite ignorant of the fact that her husband was returning with the party of warriors to lay the heads before the war stone, spoke to him . . . when she learnt the awful thing she had done, she sickened and died."[5] Amongst the Nāga tribes of Manipur, according to the same authority, sexual intercourse is prohibited to a man when he is in special danger, as when he is setting out for or returning from a raid.][6] Amongst the Ostyaks, harm

[1] A. W. Niewenhuis, *Quer durch Borneo* (1904-1907), i. 350.

[2] — van Schmid [or Schmidt], "Anteekeningen . . . van de eilanden Saparoea, Haroekoe, Noessa Laut," *Tijdschrift voor Neêrlands Indie* (1843), V. ii. 507.

[3] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 524.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 315.

[5] T. C. Hodson, "The 'Genna' amongst the Tribes of Assam," *J.A.I.* (1906), xxxvi. 100.

[6] *Id.*, *The Nāga Tribes of Manipur* (1911), p. 88.

befalls the hunter either from the ill-wishes of an enemy or from the vicinity of a woman.[1] Amongst the Ahts, whale-fishers must abstain from women.[2]

[The Indians of Nootka Sound in British Columbia, for three or four weeks before setting out on a military expedition, must abstain from sexual intercourse and undergo painful purifications.[3] A Shushwap Indian of the same region loses the supernatural power which he acquires with his guardian spirit if he sees a woman when he is on his way to war.[4] Further, "only a youth who has never touched a woman, or a virgin . . . can become shamans [*sic*]. After having had sexual intercourse men as well as women become . . . weak, incapable of gaining supernatural powers. The faculties cannot be regained by subsequent fasting and abstinence."[5] The North American Indians generally "will not cohabit with women while they are out at war; they religiously abstain from every kind of intercourse even with their own wives, for the space of three days and nights before they go to war, and so after they return home."[6] They believe that contact with women makes a warrior laughable and injures his bravery for the future.[7] Thus the hunters amongst the Tinnehs of the Portland Inlet in British Columbia if they want good luck, purify themselves by severe washings, fast, and do not touch a woman

[1] G. E. Erman, *Travels in Siberia* (1848), ii. 55.

[2] G. M. Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life* (1868), p. 227.

[3] [J. R. Jewitt], *A Narrative of the Adventures and Sufferings of John R. Jewitt* (1816), p. 148; cp. H. H. Bancroft, *op. cit.*, i. 184.

[4] F. Boas, "Second General Report on the Indians of British Columbia," *Report of the Sixtieth Meeting of the British Association* (1890), p. 645.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 581.

[6] J. Adair, *The History of the American Indians* (1775), p. 163.

[7] J. D. Hunter, *Memoirs of a Captivity among the Indians of North America* (1824), p. 299.

for two or three months.[1] The Western Tinneh leaves his marriage bed for ten days before he goes on a marten-hunt and for a month in the case of a bear-hunt; the wife must not approach or step over the snare which has been prepared, for if she does all further attempt to catch the animal will be futile.[2] The Hidatsa eagle-hunters build a special medicine-lodge into which women must not enter; during the time that they occupy this lodge the hunters see neither their families nor their friends.[3] The Dakota who wishes to succeed in any enterprise purifies himself by fasting, bathing and continence. He also tries to induce a vision. The process is particularly stringent when the enterprise is war. A young man's weapons may on no account be touched by a woman.][4] The chiefs of the Iroquois remain as a rule unmarried until they have retired from active warfare.[5] [The Winnebagoes abstain from women before departing to a war.[6] The Creek Indians held that "to sleep with women, enervates and renders them unfit for warriors; men therefore but seldom have their wives in the apartments where they lodge."[7] The Sia of New Mexico are continent for four days before going hunting.[8] The

[1] F. Boas, "Fifth Report on the Indians of British Columbia," *Report of the Sixty-Fifth Meeting of the British Association* (1895), p. 568.

[2] A. G. Morice, "Notes Archæological, Industrial and Sociological, on the Western Dénés," *Transactions of the Canadian Institute* (1892-1893), iv. 107-108.

[3] W. Matthews, *Ethnography and Philology of the Hidatsa Indians* (1877), pp. 59-60.

[4] J. O. Dorsey, "A Study of Siouan Cults," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1894 for 1889-1890), xi. 436, 444; J. Adair, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

[5] [*Journal étranger* (April 1762), pp. 132, 137.]

[6] J. E. Fletcher, "Manners and Customs of the Winnebagoes," *in* H. R. Schoolcraft, *Historical and Statistical Information* (1851-1860), v. 63.

[7] C. Swan, "Position and State of Manners and Arts in the Creek, or Muscogee Nation in 1791," in H. R. Schoolcraft, *ibid.*, v. 272.

[8] M. C. Stevenson, "The Sia," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1894 for 1889-1890), xi. 118.

Huichols of Mexico must abstain from their women when engaged on a hunting expedition : " the deer would never enter a snare put up by a man who is in love : it would just look at it, snort 'pooh, pooh,' and then turn and go back the way it came."] [1]

In South Africa, before and during an expedition, men may have no connection with women.[2] [Before a war the South African Bantus perform ceremonies for sexual purification and practise continence.[3] Of the Zulu warriors a native said that " no one among them is able to associate with his wife ; they abstain excessively ; for if a man, when the army is going out . . . associate with his wife, he kills himself, making his own eyes dark."] [4] The women may not even go near the army when it is about to set out. Old women, however, who are past child-bearing may do so : for such " have become men " and " no longer observe the custom of hlonipa in relation to the men." [5] [Upon this custom of continence for warriors Tchaka imposed celibacy.[6] The Negrillos also practise continence before fighting.[7] The natives of Loango have to keep from their wives from the day on which war is declared.[8] The fishers and hunters of the Bangala on the Upper Congo have to observe continence until they are successful in their expedition ; consequently the period of abstention may

[1] C. Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico* (1903), ii. 40-41.

[2] J. Macdonald, " Manners, Customs, Superstitions, and Religions of South African Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1890), xix. 284.

[3] H. A. Junod, " Les conceptions physiologiques des Bantou Sud-Africains et leurs Tabous," *Revue d'ethnographie et de sociologie* (1910), i. 149.

[4] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), pp. 437-438.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 441-443.

[6] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), p. 47.

[7] — Le Roy, " Les Pygmées," *Les Missions Catholiques* (1897), xxix. 269.

[8] A. Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an die Loanga-Küste* (1874-1875), i. 203.

last for some weeks.[1] The natives of (German) East Africa do not approach their wives for some days before an elephant hunt.[2] And the Wagogo in this region similarly abstain before war.[3] The Wagiriami of British East Africa believe that if men cohabit with their wives during wartime "they will be unable to kill any of their enemies, and that if they themselves receive a trifling wound it will prove fatal."[4] The neighbouring Wasania say that if a man lies with his wife during a time of hunting, his luck will be bad and he will not see any animals to kill.[5]

These typical specimens of the far more voluminous evidence of this specialised segregation of the sexes in connection with events of such outstanding importance in primitive society as hunting and war,[6] lead us to the consideration of] the very widely spread rule which insists upon the separation of the sexes, so far as is possible, at those functional crises with which sex is concerned. It is a special result of the ideas of sexual taboo applied to the most obvious sexual differences, primary sexual characters, resulting not only in this segregation but in a general belief that women are dangerous at their sexual crises.

During pregnancy there is sometimes avoidance between the wife and the husband, as in the Caroline

[1] J. H. Weeks, "Anthropological Notes on the Bangala of the Upper Congo River," *J.A.I.* (1909), xxxix. 459.

[2] P. Reichard, *Deutsch-Ostafrica* (1892), p. 427.

[3] H. Cole, "Notes on the Wagogo of German East Africa," *J.A.I* (1902), xxxii. 317.

[4] W. E. H. Barrett, "Notes on the Customs of the Wagiriami, etc., British East Africa," *J.A.I.* (1911), xli. 22.

[5] *Ibid.*, xli. 31.

[6] Cp. Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), iii. 157 *et seq.*, 190 *et seq.*

Islands, where men may not eat with their wives during pregnancy, and in Fiji where a pregnant woman may not wait upon her husband.[1] Pregnant women in the island Kisar take a knife with them when they leave the house, in order to frighten away evil spirits.[2] The same practice is found in a number of other regions. In the Ceramlaut Islands pregnant women use charms to protect themselves against evil influences.[3] [Toda women retire into seclusion-huts about the fifth month of their pregnancy.][4] Among the Basutos such women are subject to witchcraft and they wear skin-aprons to protect themselves.[5] In several Brazilian tribes, women are separated from their husbands as soon as they become pregnant.[6] And amongst the natives of Costa Rica, a woman who is for the first time pregnant "infects the whole neighbourhood," all deaths are laid to her charge and the husband pays the damages. This remarkable influence seems to be that of an evil spirit, or rather "a property acquired" by women in that state.[7]

At birth, though there are a few cases where the husband attends or assists his wife, the general rule throughout the peoples of the world is that only the female sex may be present. Thus in Buru only old women may be in the room.[8] In South Africa the

[1] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *op. cit.*, i. 137.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 417.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 173-174.

[4] W. H. R. Rivers, *The Todas* (1906), pp. 313-315.

[5] E. Casalis, *The Basutos* (1861), p. 251.

[6] J. B. von Spix *and* C. F. P. von Martius, *Travels in Brazil* (1824), p. 247.

[7] W. M. Gabb, in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* (1875), p. 505. Cp. H. H. Ploss, *Das Kind* (1911-1912), i. 26; *id.*, *Das Weib* (1905), i. 843 *et seq.*

[8] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

husband may not see his wife while she is lying in.[1] Amongst the Basutos the father is separated from mother and child for four days and may not see them until the medicine-man has performed the religious ceremony of "absolution of the man and wife." If this were neglected, it is believed that he would die when he saw his wife.[2] The Damaras may not look upon a lying-in woman, else they will become weak and consequently be killed in battle.[3] Indeed, at child-birth, more than at any other functional crisis, woman is taboo, and in that state in which religion develops evil spirits. Amongst the Alfoers, for instance, before birth, the husband sets a naked sword in front of the house to keep off evil spirits who might bring ill-luck to the delivery.[4] In the Philippine Islands there is an evil spirit which causes painful labour. It is to be recognised by its voice, and when the husband hears it he locks up the house, closing every chink, and goes round with a sword thrusting and parrying all night. In the morning he takes a well-earned rest, because "he has saved his wife."[5] Amongst the Ovaherero the woman at child-birth, and the special hut which she occupies, are both *zera*, holy.[6] [The same thing has been observed among European peasants. Thus in Armenia at child-birth the men beat the air, hoping in this way to beat away the evil spirits, and

[1] J. Macdonald, *op. cit.*, xix. 267.

[2] H. Grützner, "Die Gebräuche der Basutho," *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte* (1877), p. 78.

[3] E. Dannert, "Customs of the Ovaherero at the Birth of a Child," *Folk-Lore Journal* (Cape Town, 1880), ii. 63.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, "Die Landschaften Holontalo, Limoeto . . .," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1871), iii. 403.

[5] Sir J. Bowring, *A Visit to the Philippine Islands* (1859), p. 120; A. Bastian, *Die Voelker des oestlichen Asien* (1866-1871), v. 270.

[6] E. Dannert, *loc. cit.*

especially the non-philoprogenitive ones, that swarm there.[1] For similar reasons in the Armenian villages on the Turko-Persian frontier soldier-marionettes are set in motion and shots fired to expel the demons.[2] In Hungary the father shoots over the head of the labouring woman.][3] More often women in child-birth and for some time after are called "unclean" and frequently "taboo," but so far "holy," "taboo" and "unclean," are not differentiated. Amongst peoples who have a specific system of taboo, she is taboo; elsewhere, as a rule, she is "unclean."[4]

Especially is this the case after child-birth. The infant also is taboo and comes under the same category.[5] In the islands Amboina and Uliasser the new-born babe is subject to the attacks of evil spirits and is put by the fire for his protection.[6] In East Central Africa, when the child is seven days old, the parents believe that it is past its greatest dangers, but in order to prevent evil spirits from doing it further mischief they strew the place with dressed victuals by way of appeasing them.[7] [The pregnant Toda woman, as we have seen, has to retire into a seclusion-hut, and to this she has to return two or three days after the birth of the infant.[8] In Gujarat a woman does not go out without a knife for fourteen days

[1] M. Abeghian, *Der armenische Volksglaube* (1899), p. 119.

[2] B. Stern, *Medizin, Aberglaube und Geschlechtsleben in der Türkei* (1903), ii. 299.

[3] R. Temesváry, *Volksbräuche und Aberglaube in der Geburtshilfe und Pflege der Neugeborenen in Ungarn* (1899), p. 57.

[4] Cp. Sir J. G. Frazer, *op. cit.*, iii. 147 *et seq.*; *id.*, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament* (1918), iii. 472 *et seq.*

[5] Cp. H. H. Ploss, *Das Kind* (1911-1912), i. 100 *et seq.*

[6] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 73.

[7] D. Macdonald, *Africana* (1882), i. 224.

[8] W. H. R. Rivers, *op. cit.*, p. 324.

after the birth to her of a child.[1] In ancient India the men had to stand to arms for the whole night after a delivery.][2]

At puberty also these ideas are found, and it is a widespread rule that neither sex may see the other at this time. Amongst the Narrinyeri boys during initiation are called *narumbe*, that is, sacred from the touch of women, and everything that they possess or obtain becomes *narumbe* also.[3] In New Ireland, girls may not be seen by any males except relatives from puberty to marriage, during which time they are kept in cages.[4] No man may come near the girls of Ceram while they are being subjected to the ceremonies necessary at puberty.[5] Amongst the Basutos no women may come near the boys during initiation.[6] And a couple of examples will show the general fears entertained at this time. The Chiriguano girls fast at puberty and are secluded, while women beat the floor and walls with sticks, by way of finding and driving away "the snake that has wounded the girl."[7] The Siamese, who imagine that evil spirits swarm in the air, believe that these enjoy the first-fruits of their girls and that they cause the "wound" which renews itself every month.[8]

[1] J. Campbell, "Notes on the Spirit Basis of Belief and Custom," *The Indian Antiquary* (1895), xxviii. 57.

[2] — Weber, "Uber die *Kṛishṇajanmâshtamî* (*Kṛishṇa's Geburtsfest*)," *Philosophische und Historische Abhandlungen der Kôniglichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin . . . 1867* (1868), pp. 299-300.

[3] G. Taplin, "The Narrinyeri," in *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (1879), p. 69.

[4] B. Danks, "Marriage Customs of the New Britain Group," *J.A.I* (1889), xviii. 284.

[5] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

[6] K. Endemann, "Mittheilungen über die Satho-Neger," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1874), vi. 37.

[7] *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses* (1780-1783), viii. 333.

[8] S. de La Loubère, *Du royaume de Siam* (1691), i. 203. Cp. Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), iii. 156-157.

The same religious fears are connected with menstruation generally, and that this time the separation of the sexes is most prominent and most widely spread. As examples, there are the Pueblo Indians, amongst whom women must separate from the men at menstruation, and before delivery, because if a man touch a woman at those times he will fall ill.[1] Amongst the Maoris, if a man touched a menstruous woman he would be taboo; if he had connection with her, or ate food cooked by her, he would be "*tapu* an inch thick."[2] [Amongst the Mailu of Papua a woman is isolated during her menses and usually sleeps in a small temporary hut, or in the women's corner of the house; she is never approached sexually. Dr Malinowski adds that "much secrecy and reticence obtains between man and woman in sex matters."][3] An Australian, finding that his wife had lain on his blanket during menstruation, killed her, and died of terror in a fortnight.[4] Amongst the Veddas of Travancore, the wife at her monthly periods is secluded for five days in a hut, a quarter of a mile away, which is also used by her at child-birth. The next five days are passed in a second hut, half-way between the first and the house. On the ninth day the husband holds a feast, sprinkles his floor with wine and invites his friends. Until this evening he has not dared to eat anything but roots, for fear of being killed by "the devil."[5] [And,

[1] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America* (1875-1876), i. 549.

[2] E. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *J.A.I.* (1879), xi. 164.

[3] B. Malinowski, "The Natives of Mailu," *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Australia* (1915), xxxix. 564.

[4] W. Ridley, "Report on Australian Languages and Traditions," *J.A.I.* (1873), ii. 268; cp. E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), iii. 179.

[5] M. Bartels, "Abnorme Behaarung beim Menschen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1879), xi. 164.

according to *The Laws of Manu*, "the wisdom, the energy, the strength, the right, and the vitality of a man who approaches a woman covered with menstrual excrement, utterly perish."[1] In short, the attitude of man, and not only savage man to a menstruating woman, is well expressed in the rhyme :

Oh ! menstruating woman, thou'rt a fiend
From whom all nature should be closely screened.[2]]

Even at marriage, as we shall see,[3] there is a good deal of separation of the sexes, and actually of the bridegroom, for as long as possible. Thus, generally, at marriage, the bride is escorted by women and the bridegroom by men.

Such segregation of the sexes has influenced language.[4] [This influence may be conveniently considered as affecting language in general, and as affecting names and other terms of address. Under the former head the earliest observation of a difference between the language of men and that of women was apparently that of Raymond Breton,[5] who was for twenty years in the middle of the seventeenth century a missionary in Guadéloupe and Dominica. His observations have since been verified, and it seems that the] island Caribs have two distinct vocabularies, one used by men and by women when

[1] *The Laws of Manu*, iv. 41.

[2] Quoted by Dr Ellis, "The Influence of Menstruation on the Position of Women," *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1910), i. 291. Cp. Sir J. G. Frazer, *op. cit.*, iii. 145-147.

[3] [Below, ii. 58 *et seq.*]

[4] Cp. Sir J. G. Frazer, "A Suggestion as to the Origin of Gender in Language," *The Fortnightly Review* (1900), lxvii. 79-90 ; R. Lasch, "Über Sondersprachen und ihre Enstehung," *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* (1907), xxxvii. 89-101, 140-162.

[5] In his *Dictionnaire Caraibe-François* (1665-1666).

speaking to men, the other used by women when speaking to each other, and by men when repeating in *oratio obliqua* some saying of the women. Their councils of war are held in a secret dialect or jargon, into which the women are never initiated.[1] It has been suggested that this inconvenient custom, according to which a Carib needs to know, like Ennius, three languages, is due to exogamy [and marriage by capture], husband and wife retaining the languages of their original tribes respectively.[2] This explanation, however, does not account for the martial dialect and has been refuted on other grounds.[3] Even in cases where this explanation may hold, this cause is not the ultimate origin of the custom, but merely carries on an existing practice. Thus in some tribes of Victoria the marriage system is organised exogamy, but the inconvenience of sexual taboos has led to the use of an artificial language or "turn-tongue."[4]

In the language of the Abipones some words varied according to sex.[5] [Von Martius has made a number of observations on this point. Among the Arawak, men and women have different words even for common objects.[6] Of the Guaycurus of the Cran Chaco he remarks that "we are confronted with the strange fact

[1] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana* (1883), p. 186; W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana* (1868), p. 131; J. M. Rat, "The Carib Language as now spoken in Dominica, West Indies," *J.A.I.* (1898), xxvii. 311.

[2] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1881), p. 27. Cp. Sir J. G. Frazer, *op. cit.*, lxvii. 87-88.

[3] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *loc. cit.*; R. Lasch, *op. cit.*, xxxvii. 97; E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1921), ii. 275-277.

[4] J. Dawson, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

[5] M. Dobrizhoffer, *Historia de Abiponibus* (1784), ii. 197.

[6] C. F. P. von Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerika's zumal brasiliens* (1867), i. 704; R. Schomburgk, *Reisen in British-Guiana* (1847-1848), i. 227.

that the speech of the men is wholly, or at least in certain words, different words from that of the women."[1] The reason for this given by an earlier traveller is that the women are "barred" by the men.[2] The Karaya have a special women's dialect, which, it has been suggested, is an older form of the tribal speech, retained by the women.[3] "Of a distinct language which might have arisen through the reception of female captives from foreign tribes, there is no question here. On the one hand, the taking over of foreign women . . . is too limited to have enabled their language to have any influence, and, on the other hand, the deviations from the men's language are too small to allow us to look for a foreign derivation of the women's language."[4] The Eskimo women of the Mackenzie Delta have expressions, words and terminations which the men do not use.[5] The women of Greenland "have a particular pronunciation peculiar to themselves, and different from that of the men."][6] The proper Fijian term for a newly circumcised boy is *teve*, which may not be uttered when women are present, in which case the word *kula* is used,[7] and there are many words in the language which it is taboo to utter in female society.[8] In Micronesia, many words are tabooed for men when conversing with women.[9] In Japan, female writing has quite a different

[1] C. F. P. von Martius, *op. cit.*, i. 106.

[2] W. C. von Eschwege, *Journal von Brasilien* (1818), ii. 283.

[3] P. Ehrenreich, "Materialen zur Sprachenkunde Brasiliens," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1894), xxvi. 23; F. Krause, *In den Wildnissen Brasiliens* (1911), p. 344.

[4] F. Krause, *loc. cit.*

[5] E. F. S. Petitot, *Les grands Esquimaux* (1887), p. 140.

[6] H. Egede, *A Description of Greenland* (1818), p. 166.

[7] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 167.

[8] J. W. Anderson, *Notes of Travel in Fiji and New Caledonia* (1880), p. 89.

[9] [— Mertens, "Mémoire sur l'Archipel des Carolines," *Receuil des Actes de la Séance Publique de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St Pétersbourg* (1829), p. 137.]

syntax and many peculiar idioms ;[1] the Japanese alphabet possesses two sets of characters, katakana for the use of men and hiragana for women.[2] In Madagascar there are terms proper for a woman to use to her own sex, others for women to men, and for men to women.[3]

In connection with names, sexual taboo has developed a prohibition which has had a particular influence upon many languages. A Hindu wife is never allowed to mention the name of her husband. She generally speaks of him, therefore, as "the master" or the "man of the house"[4] [or the "father of the household."[5] If a Hindu wife so much as dreams of her husband's name, her sin will inevitably lead him to an untimely end.][6] Amongst the Todas there is some delicacy in mentioning the names of women at all ; they prefer to use the phrase "wife of so-and-so."[7] In the Pelew Islands men are not allowed to speak openly of married women, nor to mention their names.[8] In the Solomon Islands men show considerable reluctance to give the names of women, and when prevailed upon to do so, pronounce them in a low tone, as if it were not proper to speak of them to others.[9] In Fiji, again, women make their salutations in different

[1] I. L. Bird, *Unbeaten Tracks in Japan* (1880), i. 133.

[2] P. F. von Siebold, *Manners and Customs of the Japanese* (1841), i. 299.

[3] J. Sibree, "Relationships and the Names used for them among the Peoples of Madagascar," *J.A.I.* (1880), ix. 48.

[4] W. Ward, *A View of the History, Literature, and Religion of the Hindoos* (1817-1820), ii. 337.

[5] W. Crooke, *The Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India* (1896), ii. 5-6.

[6] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India* (1906), p. 533.

[7] W. E. Marshall, *A Phrenologist amongst the Todas* (1873), p. 73.

[8] J. S. Kubary, ["Die Religion der Pelauer"], *in* A. Bastian, *Allerlei aus Volks- und Menschennkunde* (1881), i. 20 ; *id.*, *Die socialen Einrichtungen der Pelauer* (1885), p. 90.

[9] H. B. Guppy, *The Solomon Islands* (1887), p. 47.

words from those of the men.[1] [The women of the Warramunga may not utter a man's ordinary name, which she knows, while he has in addition a secret name which she does not even know.[2] In North Nyasaland no woman "will state the name of her husband or even a word that may be synonymous with his name. If she were to call him by his proper name, he considers it would be unlucky and affect the powers of conception."[3] Similarly the Basuto woman is not allowed to speak her husband's name; consequently, if her husband's name is that of some common object, in speaking of that object she has to use a synonym. Thus, if her husband is called Lerotholi (drop), she may not say *lerotholi la metsi* (a drop of water), but, for instance, *malhlatsa a pula* (vomiting of rain).][4] Amongst the Barea the wife may not utter her husband's name.[5] A Kaffir woman may not call her husband by his name when addressing him or when speaking of him to others; [nor may she even think of the names of her husband's relatives in the ascending line.][6] Of her husband she must use the phrase "father of so-and-so." This applies particularly to the i-gama (real name). Further, the women may not use the interdicted words in their ordinary sense. Consequently they are obliged to alter words and phrases which contain the prohibited sounds. This has had

[1] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-1842* (1845), iii. 326.

[2] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (1904), p. 581.

[3] Sir H. H. Johnston, *British Central Africa* (1897), p. 452.

[4] — Porte, "Les réminiscences d'un missionnaire du Basutoland," *Les Missions Catholiques* (1896), xxviii. 233.

[5] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien* (1864), p. 526.

[6] J. C. Warner, *in* J. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (1858), p. 95.

considerable influence upon the language,[1] and the women have a large vocabulary of their own. Any woman transgressing the rule is accused of witchcraft by the "doctor," and punished with death. This prohibition on names belongs to the hlonipa system, and the altered vocabulary of the women, which is unintelligible to the men, is called *ukuteta kwabapzi*, "women's language."[2] Amongst the Nishinams of California a husband never calls his wife by name on any account; should he do so she has the right to get a divorce. In this tribe no one can be induced to divulge his own name.[3] [The Turkish stocks in southern Siberia also have the custom according to which women use synonyms in addressing their husbands.[4] The young wife among the South Slavs is allowed to address her husband's family only by means of a special name.][5] A Servian never speaks of his wife or daughter before men.[6]

Similar phenomena occur in all stages of culture, and in modern Europe sexual separation to some extent still influences popular language, women and men respectively using certain terms peculiar to each sex. [And, as Dr Ellis has pointed out, there is a very widespread use of special terms for the sexual organs and functions.[7] As

[1] [Cp. G. Oppert, "The Classification of Languages in Conformity with Ethnology," *J.A.I.* (1884), xiii. 41.]

[2] J. L. Döhne, *Das Kafferland und seine Bewohner* (1843), p. 22.; *id.*, *A Zulu-Kafir Dictionary* (1857), p. 139; H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), p. 316; J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857); T. Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* (1859-1872), ii. 388.

[3] S. Powers, *The Tribes of California* (1877), p. 315.

[4] V. V. Radlov, *Proben der Volksliteratur der Turkischen Stämme Süd-Siberiens* (1866-1886), iii. 13 *n*[3].

[5] K. Rhamm, "Der Verkehr des Geschlechter unter den Slaven in seinen gegensätzlichen Erscheinungen," *Globus* (1902), lxxxii. 192.

[6] G. Maxwell, "Slava," *Folk-Lore* (1891), ii. 71.

[7] H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1910), i. 67.

regards that part of the phenomena which we have just considered relating to names and the like, Sir James Frazer has explained the world-wide reluctance to use or divulge these as due to the belief that] the name is a vital part of a man, and often regarded as a sort of soul.[1] Sexual taboo has used this idea to form a special duty as between men and women, especially as between husbands and wives. In one or two cases feelings of proprietary jealousy have doubtless had some influence, but as a rule the religious fears have played the chief part in the prohibition. [Dr Westermarck accepts this general conclusion that these phenomena connected with language are principally due to sexual separation and sexual taboo; but he adds that "peculiarities of speech are always apt to arise among people who are closely associated with each other, as the inhabitants of the same district or the members of the same class of society."[2] This is no doubt true, but the peculiarities created in this way are common to all the members of the particular group, and not to one sex only. Indeed, as Dr Westermarck himself points out, it is not close association that produces sexual differences in speech, but rather the isolation of women. Discussing the passage which I have quoted from Krause,[3] Dr Westermarck says: "The comparative isolation of the women from the outside world undoubtedly accounts for the fact, noticed by myself among the Berbers of the Great Atlas, that the women use the old Berber numerals in cases where the men invariably use Arabic loan-words."[4]

[1] *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), iii. 318 *et seq.*

[2] *The History of Human Marriage* (1921), ii. 276.

[3] [Above, i. 79.]

[4] E. Westermarck, *op. cit.*, ii. 277.

We have now briefly surveyed the main facts of sexual taboo showing themselves in the segregation of the sexes, or rather, the instinctive separation of the sexes hardening into tradition and finally made the subject of taboo. We have found this manifesting itself in connection with houses, other resting-places and subsidiary matters; this led to a consideration of sexual solidarity and inter-sexual antagonism, shown for instance, in the male and female secret societies, in the so-called sex totems and in the common exclusion of women from religious ceremonies; from this we proceeded to the evidence drawn from the respective occupations of the sexes, the biological differences in which have been greatly exaggerated by sexual taboo; this led to the curious evidence for sexual separation provided by the rules of continence observed by many peoples before hunting and fighting; from which we passed on to sexual segregation as it is aggravated by sexual crises; and finally to an observable effect of this segregation on language. We must now attempt a preliminary analysis of sexual taboo. To begin with the] avoidance between the sexes at sexual crises, as a rule more emphasised than that during ordinary life, the question may be asked, is the avoidance at the sexual crises merely an extension of that at ordinary times. When we penetrate to the ideas lying behind both, we shall find these to be identical, and of such a specific character and universal extent that we must suppose the sex taboos imposed at sexual crises to be simply emphasised results of these ideas. Not to anticipate what will be treated of later,[1] it may be pointed out first that perhaps the most widely spread and the most stringent of all sex-taboos has nothing to do with

[1] [Below, Ch. VII.]

sexual functions—this is the prohibition against eating together. In the second place, in order rightly to estimate the whole of the evidence, it must be borne in mind that these sexual functions are parallel to the various occupations of the respective sexes : in primitive thought child-bearing is as much a feminine occupation as is the preparation of meals, and the confirmation of a boy as much of a male occupation as are warfare and the chase. Also, it is clear from a survey of the various cases of sexual taboo, first, that the avoidance is of the religious and taboo character ; secondly, that men and women are afraid of dangerous results from each other —the fact that we see more of the man's side of the question is an instance of the way in which the male sex has practically monopolised the expression of thought [for if we could hear more of the women's side " the reciprocal exclusiveness of the spheres of man and woman would be more apparent "] ;[1] and thirdly, that where one sex or the other is particularly liable to danger, as men at war and women at child-birth, more care is naturally taken to prevent injury from the other sex.

In the taboos against eating together we shall see an expression of that almost universal preference for solitude while important physiological functions are proceeding, due ultimately to the instinct of self-preservation in the form of subconscious physiological thought arising from those functions ; and in the taboos against one or the other sex in sexual crises the same preference is seen, commuted by sexual solidarity to a preference for the presence of the same sex ; and in all forms of taboo it is evident that to a religious

[1] E. S. Ames, *The Psychology of Religious Experience* (1910), p. 66 *n.*

regard for personal security there has been applied a religious diffidence concerning persons who are more or less unknown, different from what is normal, different, that is, from one's self and outside one's own experience.

So far, then, we may take it that the complementary difference, producing by physiological laws or certain difference of life no less than of function, came in an early stage of mental development to be accentuated by religious ideas, which thus enforced more strongly such separation as is due to nature. The separation thus accentuated by religious conceptions as to sexual difference, is assisted by the natural solidarity of each sex, until there is, as we find so very generally, a prohibition or sex-taboo more or less regularly imposed throughout life. Man and woman are as ignorant of each other as if they were different species; they are constantly tending to become what they never can become, two divided castes; every woman and every man are, as men and women, potentially taboo to each other.

All living religious conceptions spring from more or less constant functional origins, physiological and psychological. Now when we look at mankind in general, and in particular at civilised societies, we find that men as a rule prefer to associate with men and women with women, except on those occasions when the functional need of love, for instance, call for union and sympathy between the sexes. We may thus realise that the same biological causes, working through human ideas of primary and secondary sexual difference, produce this subconscious preference which we find in the civilised man, and with more primitive expression in the civilised

boy, no less than the religious preference which we find amongst early peoples.[1]

[1] [Professor W. I. Thomas, of the University of Chicago, after quoting the whole of this chapter, writes, *Source Book for Social Origins* (1909), p. 534, that Mr Crawley "is possessed with the idea that magic is at the root of many if not most of marriage practices, and he often slips in the magical, secondary, and particularistic explanation where it does not belong." With this accusation, which is unsupported by argument or specific references, may be compared the last few paragraphs of this chapter, and, as regards the "functional psychology" anthropologists in general, page 61, above.]

61 & 86 contradict

CHAPTER IV

HUMAN RELATIONS

Before passing on to the discussion of primitive ideas of human relations, there is the problem of the connection of human persons with the spiritual agencies of taboo in its social aspect to be considered [with special emphasis on the beliefs, which have been outlined in the second chapter, concerning the powers of omnipresent evil spirits and the supernatural nature of death and disease].

Primitive science is materialistic and the fact is evident in every case cited that evil or harm—even when due to evil spirits—is of a material nature. Evil spirits in the first place are warded off by material methods. Thus the Khonds prevent the approach of Joogah Pennu, the goddess of smallpox, by barricading the paths with thorns and ditches, and by boiling cauldrons of stinking oil.[1] Amongst the Bechuanas, to arrest disease or to prevent it from entering a village, a pointed stone is planted at the middle of the entrance or a cross-bar is smeared with "medicine."[2] [And the whole series of facts connected with the propitiation of spiritual beings or influences by means of material offerings should be compared in this connection.]

[1] S. C. Macpherson, *Memorials of Service in India* (1865), p. 370.

[2] J. P. Meeurusen, "Customs and Superstitions among the Betshuana," *Folk-Lore Journal* (Cape Town, 1879), i. 34.

In the next place, there is a vagueness as to the distinction between spirits and material influence. Amongst the natives of Central Australia, *Arungquiltha* is the term applied to persons or persons possessed of magical power. For instance, "a pointing stick used by a medicine man is *Arungquiltha:* it is applied indiscriminately to the magical influence itself, and to the object in which it is resident. It is a vague term, and sometimes can be best expressed by saying that a thing is possessed by an evil spirit."[1] In the Luang Sermata islands sickness is caused by bad food, "bad wind," and the influence of evil persons or evil spirits.[2] Amongst the Indians of Costa Rica there are two kinds of ceremonial uncleanness, *nya* and *bu-ku-rú*. The former is connected with death, the latter, which is the more virulent, is most dangerous from a woman in her first pregnancy, as we have already seen.[3] She infects the whole neighbourhood and all deaths are laid at her door. People going from her house carry the contagion with them. Arms and utensils transmit it and therefore the people beat things with a stick before using them, or sweep the house. Of this *bu-ku-rú* our authority says that "it is an evil spirit, or rather a property acquired."[4] Indeed, the personification of various evils and of diseases and plagues is so well known as to need no illustration. In the following cases there is a confusion between evil spirits and contagious matter, real or imaginary.

Amongst the Dieris and neighbouring tribes of South Australia no one is believed to contract a disease or

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 548.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 327.

[3] [Above, i. 40.]

[4] W. M. Gabb, in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* (1875), p. 505.

complaint, or even to die, from natural causes. The disease or death is caused by some enemy, of their own or neighbouring tribe, and in any serious case the doctors are called in to beat out the devil. "This is done by beating the ground in and out of the camp, and chasing him away for some distance." Also, "many an innocent man has been condemned to death through this superstition, being believed to have in his possession the small bone of a human leg."[1] The Maoris believe that the spirits of dead ancestors could send a *kahukahu* to a man; this would enter his body and feed on his vital parts. In a Maori poem the statement occurs, "should the *kahukahu* gnaw spitefully, it will be certain death." The *kahukahu* is the personification of the germs of a human being, supposed to be contained in the *menses*, and the Maoris avoid contact with menstrual blood as if it were a poison.[2] Again, in Manchuria the sedan-chair in which the bride goes to the home of the groom is "disinfected" with incense to drive away evil spirits.[3] These seem therefore to be regarded as material influences resembling germs of a disease. The properties of the taboo state are in fact always material and transmissible, and are removed by material methods as if they were a physical secretion or emanation. Thus in Fiji, when taboo is removed, the tabooed persons wash in a stream; they then take an animal, a pig or turtle, on which they wipe their hands, and this animal becomes sacred to the chief. The taboo is now off, and they are free to work, to feed themselves and to live with their

[1] S. Gason, "The Tribes, Dieyerie, Auminie, Yandrawontha, Yarawuarka, Pilladopa," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 170.

[2] E. Shortland, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand* (1851), pp. 294-295.

[3] J. H. S. Lockhart, "The Marriage Ceremonies of the Manchus," *Folk-Lore* (1890), i. 487.

wives.[1] In Borneo[2] and South Celebes[3] evil spirits, after a funeral, for instance, cling to one's body "like a burr." The Friar Roman Pane described a native sorcerer in the West Indies "pulling the disease off the patient's legs as one pulls off a pair of trousers."[4] In the New Hebrides ceremonial "uncleanness," as from death or child-birth, is taken off by sweeping a branch over the body.[5] To cure a sick person the Navajo priest pressed bundles of stuff to different parts of the body from head to foot. Each time, after pressing them on the body, he "held them up to the smoke-hole, and blew on them in that direction a quick puff, as if blowing away some evil influence which the bundles were supposed to draw from the body." These bundles were then buried.[6]

We see then that evil spirits are not always clearly distinguished from the transmissible properties of matter. The latter are no doubt often regarded logically enough as the emanations of the "evil spirit," the trail or slime of the serpent; but the points to be stressed are, first, that where evil spirits are predicated of tabooed persons, the evil can be transmitted by contagion and infection; secondly, that many so-called "evil spirits" are not supernatural at all, but evil material properties of natural things or of human persons. Further, this latter notion

[1] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-42* (1845), ii. 99.

[2] M. T. H. Perelaer, *Ethnographische Beschrijving der Dajaks* (1870), pp. 44, 54, 252.

[3] B. F. Matthes, *Bijdragen tot de Ethnologie van Zuider-Celebes* (1875), p. 49.

[4] ["Concerning the Antiquities of the Indians," *in* J. Pinkerton, *A General Collection of Voyages and Travels* (1808-1814), xii. 87.]

[5] D. Macdonald, *Oceania* (1889), p. 184.

[6] W. Matthews, "The Mountain Chant: a Navajo Ceremony," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1887 for 1883-1884), p. 420.

is a factor in the process of anthropomorphic personification, of which there is more to be said ; and the whole set of phenomena illustrates the importance of material contact as leading to transmission of material evil.

In fact, the inherent materialism of human thought, which so hardly allows of progress to idealism, is even more in evidence among primitive men than it is now. Primitive man believes in the supernatural, but supernatural beings and existences are to him really material—the supernatural is a part of and obeys the laws of nature. How difficult it is to conceive of immaterial existence, except by a negation of thought, is well seen in popular conceptions of the soul, especially those of modern spiritualism. In the last analysis of these conceptions, the soul is generally found to be simply attenuated or etherialised matter. Similar are the conceptions of early man, not only of the soul, but, of all supernatural beings, existences and influences ; and they are well illustrated by the methods used in dealing with such, being generally those that would be used in dealing with matter.

In the next place, there are the familiar facts of anthropomorphism. "Man never knows how anthropomorphic he is." Goethe's epigram applies most completely to early man, for he is more anthropomorphic in his ideas and is less aware of the fact. He thinks of everything in terms of himself, and his ideal creations of supernatural being are generally in his own image, or in the image of animals which for him are man-like as possessing such close similarities of structure and of function. The modern theories of descent would have been easily understood in its general outline by early man, who has, by the way, several conceptions which foreshadow them. The Digger Indians of California

say that their ancestors derived their existences from *coyotes;* these became Indians, but as one died the body was changed into a number of little creatures which were gradually developed into deer, elks and antelopes; others took wing and flew about in the air. Men originally went on all fours and gradually progressed to a higher organisation. While in a state of transition they were in the habit of sitting upright and from this cause, having worn off their tails, they now appear without this appendage.[1] The Central Australians have a theory of man's descent from animals.[2]

There is often a natural confusion between the person who is possessed or obsessed by spirits, and the spirits themselves, as in the case of him whose name was Legion. Thus, according to the Cambodians, the *Arak* are spirits, dwelling in trees or houses. Grou are sorcerers, men and women, who invoke the *Arak* and are possessed by these. During the period of possession they are themselves called *Arak*, the latter being incarnate in them.[3] The Nickol Bay natives believe in an evil spirit, *Juno*, who kills men; when a man of the tribe prowls about seeking to kill other blacks, he is said to be a *Juno* for the time.[4]

A priori it would be expected that in cases where a dangerous condition or taboo state arises in close connection with a man's fellow-men, he should have inferred from his experience of all human relations that danger was due to one or more of his fellows, and psychology bears this out.

[1] A. Featherman, *Social History of the Races of Mankind* (1885-1891), iii. 215.

[2] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *op. cit.*, p. 392.

[3] É. Aymonier, "Note sur les coutumes et croyances superstitienses der Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine Française* (1883), vi. 176.

[4] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), i. 298.

In the psychology of personification there are two processes to be observed. First, there are the phenomena of ideation, especially when visualised. The fact that the memory-image is formed below the threshold of consciousness, and suddenly emerges complete in outline, is one of great importance for the origin and development of animistic thought.[1] As a simple illustration let us take the case of a man who is in fear of another. For this, by the way, we often use the instructive phrase "bodily fear." Such a man will chiefly avoid personal contact, as likely to result in personal injury, and all ill that happens to him he will ascribe to the influence of his enemy; while in the secret depths of his soul the image of his foe, impressed upon his brain, is lying dormant, ready at any moment to rise above the threshold. Whenever he closes his eyes to shut out the thought of his enemy, the image of him appears. His brain is, in a word, "obsessed" by the image of his foe. This memory-image, presented to complete consciousness, we believe to be a factor in the origin of anthropomorphic animism, of no less importance than its subconscious appearance in sleep. The man's own soul has thus acquired an image of his foe, a tiny but evil spirit, which appears within him, he knows not how nor whence. Its presence helps him to explain "possession," and certain conceptions of personal influence, and of the supernatural powers of man. The actual result to the subject, apart from actual violence at his enemy's hands, might be illness from fear. There are cases on record where similar fear has killed a man. If the man did fall ill in this way, he would be perfectly justified in inferring his enemy to have caused the illness. There are besides numerous cases where

[1] [Mr Crawley has developed this suggestion in his *The Idea of the Soul* (1909). Cp. W. McDougall, *Body and Mind* (1913), p. 4 *n*³.]

illness is attributed to potential, in default of actual human foes. Early man knows nothing of bacteriology, but he has the great principle of contagion very strongly outlined and extended all round the circle of human relations. If a man who is sick is conscious of having made an enemy, he generally attributes his sickness to him ; for to his mind man can do everything and everything he does is potentially transmissible. In cases such as drowning, injury from lightning, and from various natural forces or objects other than man, of course other agencies are inferred, though many such are anthropomorphic ; but where a man, as in social relations is generally the case, can ascribe his troubles to human agency, he does so. [This point has been admirably illustrated by Dr Malinowski, who writes : " Health to the Melanesians is a natural state of affairs, and, unless tampered with, the human body will remain in perfect order. But the native knows perfectly well that there are natural means which can affect health and even destroy the body. . . . But besides these natural causes there is the enormous domain of sorcery and by far the most cases of illness and death are ascribed to this."] [1]

Again, our supposed subject does not distinguish the real and the ideal, and from this would arise a crowd of ideas and precautionary measures against the ubiquitous evil image of his foe, as well as against his actual self. And there will be thus a constant interchange between his natural and his supernatural dangers. Now, fear is the main cause of the precautions of taboo, and though we do not insist that ideas concerning contact obtain a religious connotation before the creation of evil spirits, yet there is no doubt that the two sets of ideas are, in

[1] B. Malinowski, " Magic, Science and Religion," in *Science, Religion and Reality* (1925), p. 33.

reference to human relations, correlative and that they work together. Just as in artistic criticism one comes back in the end to the personality behind a work, so in human relations the beginning and the ending is personality and personal contact. In these relations the danger, which is both real and ideal, proceeds from man and returns to man—the link between say, the first meeting with an enemy, and the second, being that veritable Erinys, the visualised image of him in the other's mind.

We now proceed to give actual cases from the relations of man with man, in which ideas of physical and spiritual danger combine in persons. There is a large mass of such facts, and we find that the attribution of human ills and sicknesses to human agency is more pronounced in the lower and less in the higher stages of culture, while modern science brings us back to the view of the lower races.

[We have already considered a number of cases in which there is a belief in the joint or interchangeable activities of supernatural and human malevolence in the creation of death and illness,[1] and] in the following cases we may see the actual meeting-place and reconciliation of the two theories as to the origin of the moral law, from supernatural and from human sanctions. For these are cases where, behind the spiritual, there is a human agent at work. Amongst the Yorubas the god Egungun becomes incarnate from time to time, in this way : a man dressed up like the god goes about and carries off people who are troublesome to their neighbours. "He is thus a kind of supernatural inquisitor, who appears from time

[1] [Above, i. 32 *et seq.*]

to time to inquire into the conduct of people, particularly of women, and to punish misdeeds. Although it is well known that Egungun is only a disguised man, yet it is popularly believed that to touch him, even by accident, causes death."[1] In British Guiana blood-revenge is closely connected with the system of sorcery. If a man dies and it is supposed that an enemy has killed him by means of an evil spirit, they employ a sorcerer to find him. A near relative is then charged with the duty of vengeance, he becomes a *Kanaima*, *i.e.*, he is possessed by the destroying spirit so called, and has to live apart, according to strict rules, and to submit to many privations, till the deed of blood is done. When the man is killed, the murderer must pass a stick through his body, to taste the victim's blood. Not until this is done does he become an ordinary man once more, but wanders about, and madness comes upon him through the agency of the disappointed spirit. The family of the victim, to prevent the *Kanaima* getting at the body, sometimes manage to bury it in a secret place, or to take out the liver and put a red-hot axe in its place. Then, if the *Kanaima* visit the corpse, the heat of the axe-head will pass into his body and consume him. Sometimes they pour *ourali* poison on the body for the purpose of destroying the *Kanaima*. In cases of secret enmity poison is used, and, in consequence of all this, the Indians seldom consider themselves safe. He against whom or whose near relative wrong has been done, becomes a *Kanaima*, and all injury which befalls an Indian is the work of such. The *Kanaima* may assume any shape, often that of the jaguar (which is the most dangerous animal known to the Indian), often an inanimate shape ;

[1] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), p. 107.

for instance, the *peaiman* will extract from his patient a stick or stone, which is the bodily form of the *Kanaima* causing illness.[1] Very similar is the practice of *Kurdaitcha* amongst the Central Australians.[2]

Is there any similar correlation of "spirits" and human beings, or of spiritual and human influence, in the relations of the one sex with the other? We may well expect that there should be, and there are facts which show it.

We have already noted, in another connection, the cases of the Pomo and Tatu Indians of California, and of the Mandingos of Senegambia, who frighten their women folk and keep them in order by periodic impersonations of ogres or of devils.[3] Amongst the Krumen, when a wife dies, the husband is believed to have caused her death by witchcraft.[4] In Congo, widows and widowers are charged with the same.[5] In Loango, when a man is ill, his wife is accused of causing the illness by witchcraft, and must undergo the *cassa* ordeal.[6] In Luzon, wives are sometimes bewitched by their husbands.[7] The Chiquitos used to kill the wife of a sick man, believing her to be the cause of his illness.[8] In China, a man's illness is often attributed to the spirit of a former wife.[9]

[1] W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana* (1868), pp. 357-360; Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guinana* (1883), p. 368.

[2] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 47.

[3] Above, i. 54-55.

[4] J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa* (1856), p. 115.

[5] M. Laird *and* R. A. K. Oldfield, *Narrative of an Expedition into the Interior of Africa* (1837), ii. 278.

[6] A. Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an die Loanga-Küste* (1874-1875), i. 46.

[7] P. de Tavera, "Die medicinischen Kenntnisse der Eingeborenen der Insel Luzon," *Globus* (1885), xlvii. 314.

[8] M. Dobrizhoffer, *Historia de Abiponibus* (1784), ii. 264.

[9] J. Doolittle, *Social Life of the Chinese* (1867), i. 146.

In Halmahera, women who die in child-bed are supposed to become evil spirits, *oputiana*, who emasculate men, and cause injury to pregnant women.[1] This belief is also found among the Malays.[2] Among the Kei islanders, if a woman dies in child-bed they kill the babe, to prevent the woman becoming a Pontianak, in which case she would haunt her husband and emasculate him.[3] It is easy to see how this sort of belief correlates with, if it does not arise from, a common phase of sexual fear.

In the next examples connected with sexual relations there is no hint of spiritual influence at all, human influence alone has the deleterious result. The Cambodians have the following belief in the case of a young married pair, neither of whom has been married before. When the wife is *enceinte* for the first time, the husband is able to take from her the fruit of her womb by means of sexual influence over her. Accordingly, the parents of the bride never trust their son-in-law and will not let the young couple go out of their sight. In Cambodia the married pair live with or near the bride's parents.[4] When a Halmaherese woman is three months pregnant, she uses protective charms to prevent evil men destroying the babe. She may not eat the remains of her husband's food, "because that would cause difficult labour."[5] In Amboina, men are not allowed to see a woman confined,

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 85.

[2] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 434.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 239.

[4] É. Aymonier, "Note sur les coutumes et croyances superstitieuses des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine Française* (1883), vi. 187.

[5] J. G. F. Riedel, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 79.

because "their presence would hinder the birth;"[1] similarly in the Aru Islands.[2] Conversely, at the feast to celebrate the birth in the Luang Sermata Islands, only women may be present. If men partook of even the slightest morsel they would be unlucky in all their undertakings.[3] Next there is an extension of the idea, which has had much influence on morality, in the theory that sickness and abnormality are due to sin. The people of the last-mentioned islands believe that prolonged pains in child-birth are due to the woman having had forbidden intercourse.[4] In Cambodia, if a child is born with two locks of hair, husband and wife suspect each other of infidelity.[5] In Wetar, sickness may be caused to the injured person, wife, husband or lover, by infidelity.[6] If birth is difficult, the Samoyeds suspect the woman of adultery.[7] This kind of magical deleterious human influence is also clearly seen in all the various phenomena of sexual taboo, such as those already reviewed,[8] and others to be dealt with later.[9]

[This excursus has now led us back to the main consideration with which we are immediately concerned, the belief of primitive peoples that illness and the like are due to human influence.] In Ceram-laut, sickness is caused through the influence of evil spirits or through "poisoning" by evil persons, *suwanggi*. The two methods are practically interchangeable, and appear

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 73.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 263. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 326. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 325.

[5] É. Aymonier, *op. cit.*, vi. 169. [6] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 451.

[7] J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie* (1736), p. 14.

[8] [Above, Ch. III.] [9] [Below, i. 198 *et seq.*]

throughout the islands between Celebes and New Guinea, or Papua, as it is now called.[1] In the Aru Islands, such persons are able to extract men's souls. They can make themselves invisible and take the shape of bat, pig, dog, crocodile or bird.[2] In the Babar Islands, evil persons make others evil by magic. When such are found out they are put to death.[3] In Siam, disease is attributed to sorcery.[4] Amongst the Dravidian Gonds, the fear of witchcraft and the evil eye is so great that "there is nothing they will not do to guard themselves against these influences."[5] Amongst the Bannars, every misfortune is attributed to the malice of persons who have the power of influencing their fate.[6] In Tongareva, death is attributed to witchcraft.[7] In Hawaii, disease could be caused by the prayers of an enemy.[8] Amongst the Dieri and cognate tribes of Australia, "no person dies a natural death; death is supposed to be caused by some evil-disposed person of their own or neighbouring tribe; they religiously believe this superstition, it is called *Mookoo elieduckuna* (translation: *Mookoo*, 'bone,' *duckuna*, 'to strike,' *i.e.*, struck by a bone).[9] Amongst the tribes of North-West Australia, no man can die unless he has been bewitched. "Some one is supposed to come at night and take away the fat out of the man's belly; and his friends must

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, pp. 178, 265, 304, 305, 341.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 253, 327. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 358.

[4] S. de La Loubère, *Du royaume de Siam* (1691), i. 206.

[5] H. B. Rowney, *The Wild Tribes of India* (1882), p. 15.

[6] H. Mouhot, *Travels in the Central Parts of Indo-China* (1864), ii. 28.

[7] W. W. Gill, *Jottings from the Pacific* (1885), p. 225.

[8] W. Ellis, *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii* (1826), p. 258.

[9] S. Gason, "The Tribes, Dieyerie, Auminie, Yandrawontha, Yarawuarka, Pilladopa," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 170.

find out who did it, to kill him."[1] The natives in the district of Powell's Creek, in the northern district of South Australia, ascribe "death or illness to some strange black-fellow, belonging to another tribe, who has doomed a certain man or woman to die or suffer from ill-health. It is not unusual, such is their superstitious belief, that a man, apparently in good health, will in a very short time lose condition and die, under the impression that he has been doomed by a member of some other tribe."[2] The people of the Belyando tribe believe that no strong man dies except as the consequence of witchcraft. "That should A and B, two strong blacks of the same tribe who were quite friendly go out hunting together, and A, on returning to the camp, be suddenly taken ill and die, the tribe would believe that B had killed him by means of witchcraft, and demand his life accordingly."[3] Amongst the Murray River natives, at the funeral of a dead person a relative generally attempted to spear some one, till it was explained that the deceased did not die by sorcery.[4] Messrs Spencer and Gillen remark of the Central Australians, "the undercurrent of anxious feeling, which, though it may be stilled, and indeed forgotten for a time, is yet always present. In his natural state the native is often thinking that some enemy is attempting to harm him by means of evil magic, and, on the other hand, he never knows when a medicine-man in some distant group may not point him out as guilty

[1] P. W. Bassett-Smith, "The Aborigines of North-West Australia," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 327.

[2] "The Habits, etc., of the Aborigines in district of Powell's Creek, Northern Territory of South Australia," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 178.

[3] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), iii. 27-28.

[4] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 349, 353.

of killing some one else by magic. It is, however," they add, "easy to lay too much stress upon this. . . . It is not right to say that the Australian native lives in constant dread of the evil magic of an enemy. The feeling is always, as it were, lying dormant, and ready to be called up by any strange or suspicious sound."[1] "All ailments of every kind, from the simplest to the most serious, are without exception attributed to the malign influence of an enemy in either human or spirit shape."[2] The Kurnai believed that death only occurred from accident, open violence, or secret magic. The magical influence of enemies was the ordinary cause of death, though this was sometimes attributed to evil spirits.[3]

"Amongst most Congo tribes death is seldom regarded in the light of a natural event. In most cases the charm doctor accuses an old person, or a slave, of having been the cause. The accused is forthwith secured, and at an appointed time is submitted to a poison ordeal."[4] Amongst the Bongos, old women are especially suspected of alliance with wicked spirits, and are accused if sudden death occurs.[5] Amongst the Yorubas, witchcraft is the chief cause of sickness and of death.[6] In the tribes of East Central Africa, disease and sudden death are attributed to witchcraft. The notorious "smelling out" of the guilty person follows, and

[1] *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 53-54.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 530.

[3] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), pp. 251, 258.

[4] H. Ward, "Ethnographical Notes relating to the Congo Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 287.

[5] G. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa* (1873), i. 307.

[6] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), p. 118.

if found he is put to death.[1] But here, it may be observed, reality and imagination sometime coincide, for the doctor who can kill by magic will administer real poison for a fee.[2] Amongst the Maoris, among whom prevailed an almost universal belief in witchcraft, if a chief or his wife or child fell ill, it was attributed to witchcraft. But those possessing the art were often hired to bewitch people.[3] The Indians of Guiana attribute all disease to sorcery. The sorcerer is credited with the power of curing as well as causing illness.[4] The Abipones thought that man could only die by magic, and a sick man often suspected some person of making him ill, and accordingly would go for him.[5] The Chiquitos often attributed disease to the female "jugglers" or lady-doctors.[6] The Guarani magicians could inflict and ward off disease and death.[7] There are also interesting cases showing how zoomorphism and reality correlate, as in Tenimber and Timor-laut, where various illnesses are due to evilly disposed persons or evil spirits, taking the form of birds.[8]

Thus in the phenomena of social taboo, human and spiritual agencies meet in persons. With the special cases described, we may compare the facts of incarnation, the evidence of ghost phenomena (in which the ghost possesses the form and characteristics of the person it

[1] J. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 104. [Cp. Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Worship of Nature* (1926), i. 143-144.]

[2] J. Macdonald, *op. cit.*, xxii. 105.

[3] W. Yate, *An Account of New Zealand* (1835), p. 95.

[4] W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana* (1868), p. 365.

[5] M. Dobrizhoffer, *Historia de Abiponibus* (1784), ii. 84, 223, 227.

[6] *Ibid.*, ii. 264. [7] *Ibid.*, i. 71.

[8] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Pupua* (1886), p. 305.

once tenanted, in more or less exact resemblance), the ideas which led to the preservation of the dead body, as by the Egyptians and others, in order to save the soul, and the evidence of the psychology of ideation. We have reached the conclusion, then, that in social taboo the "spiritual" dangers feared come from a man's fellow-men, and thus of the evil "spirits" or influences which surround him some are simply spiritualised persons or their qualities; and in sexual taboo the "spiritual" dangers feared come from the other sex, and the evil "spirits" or influences connected with sexual acts and functions are spiritualised persons of their own sex or their sexual characters materialised. The connection, of course, is mostly subconscious, but the importance of subconscious thought can hardly be over-estimated, though man cannot trace back the origin of his own ideas into their various associations. With the great mass of mankind in any age, this direct connection of sexual danger with actual living influence of the other sex, has perhaps never risen into consciousness; with the majority of human beings such danger is and has been attributed to external vague "spiritual" agencies; but the patent evidence of biology upon the complementary nature of sex, and that of psychology as to the development of emotional attitudes from functional phenomena, especially in connection with sex, prove conclusively that we are to find the ultimate origin of idea and practice relating to sex in actual sexual difference embodied in persons. And conversely, there is the romantic fact that human persons who are mysterious or not understood, as is the case with woman and man in their mutual aspect, that is, potentially dangerous, can be regarded as spiritual persons, supernatural existences: indeed, with primitive man there is often no clear distinction drawn between those who are

made lower than the angels and the angelic hosts themselves. These considerations assist us to see not only the correlation of taboo and "spiritual," or rather hylo-idealistic, danger, but also the religious character, whether magical or superstitious, of human relations in primitive thought.

CHAPTER V

HUMAN RELATIONS (*Continued*)

GENERAL ideas concerning human relations are the medium through which sexual taboo works, and these must now be examined. If we compare the facts of social taboo generally or of its subdivision, sexual taboo, we find that the ultimate test of human relations, in both genus and species, is contact. An investigation of primitive ideas concerning the relations of man with man, when guided by this clue, will lay bare the principles which underlie the theory and practice of sexual taboo. Arising, as we have seen, from sexual differentiation, and forced into permanence by difference of occupation and sexual solidarity, this segregation receives the continuous support of religious conceptions as to human relations. These conceptions centre upon contact, and ideas of contact are at the root of all conceptions of human relations at any stage of culture ; contact is the one universal test, as it is the most elementary form, of mutual relations. Psychology bears this out, and the point is psychological rather than ethnological.

As we have pointed out before, and shall have occasion to point out again, a comparative examination, assisted by psychology, of the emotions and ideas of average modern humanity, is a most valuable aid to ethnological inquiry. In this connection, we find that desire or willingness for physical contact is an animal emotion, more or less subconscious, which is characteristic of

similarity, harmony, friendship or love. Throughout the world, the greeting of a friend is expressed by contact, whether it be nose-rubbing or the kiss, the embrace or the clasp of hands; so the ordinary expression of friendship by a boy, that eternal savage, is contact of arm and shoulder. More interesting still, for our purpose, is the universal expression by contact of the emotion of love. To touch his mistress is the ever-present desire of the lover, and in this impulse, even if we do not trace it back, as we may without being fanciful, to polar or sexual attraction inherent in the atoms, the φιλία of Empedocles, yet we may place the beginning and ending of love. When analysed, the emotion always comes back to contact. As Clough puts it: "Well, I know, after all, it is only juxtaposition. Juxtaposition, in short, and what is juxtaposition?" Further, mere willingness for contact is found universally when the person to be touched is healthy, if not clean, and where he is of the same age and class, or caste, and, we may add, for ordinary humanity, the same sex.

On the other hand, the avoidance of contact, whether consciously or subconsciously presented, is no less the universal characteristic of human relations where similarity, harmony, friendship and love are absent. This appears in the attitude of men to the sick, to strangers, distant acquaintances, enemies and in cases of difference of age, position, sympathies or aims, and even of sex. Popular language is full of phrases which illustrate this feeling.

Again, the pathology of the emotions supplies many curious cases in which the whole being seems concentrated upon the sense of touch, with abnormal desire or disgust for contact; and in the evolution of the emotions from physiological pleasure and pain, contact plays an im-

portant part in connection with functional satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the environment. [Dr Freud, while accepting the suggestion that contact forms the basis of human relations and especially the correlation of the contact instincts with their manifestations in the neuroses, refers taboo itself to another cause. Dr Freud approaches his effort to solve the problem "with perfect confidence,"[1] and proceeds to give his definition in the following words: "Taboos are very ancient prohibitions which at one time were forced upon a generation of primitive people from without, that is, they probably were forcibly impressed upon them by an earlier generation. These prohibitions concerned actions for which there existed a strong desire."[2] I shall have to return to the Freudian position in general, but it must be confessed at once that this view appears as improbable ethnologically as it does psychologically. Ethnologically there exists no evidence in support of this theory, and psychologically it seems extremely improbable that instincts so deeply rooted in humanity should have been implanted on a single specific occasion. Dr Freud seems here to be ignoring his own principles.]

In the next place there are the facts, first, that an element of thought inheres in all sensation, while sensation conditions thought; and secondly, that there is a close connection of all the senses, both in origin, each of them being a modification of the one primary sense of touch, and in subsequent development, where the specialised organs are still co-ordinated through tactile sensation in the sensitive surfaces of the organisms. Again, and here we see the genesis of ideas of contact, it is by means of the tactile sensibility of the skin and

[1] S. Freud, *Totem and Taboo* (1919), p. vi. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 52-53.

membranes of sense-organs, forming a sensitised as well as a protecting surface, that the nervous system conveys to the brain information about the external world, and this information is in its original aspect the response to impact. Primitive physics, no less than modern, recognises that contact is a modified form of a blow. These considerations show that contact not only plays an important part in the life of the soul, but that it must have had a profound influence on the development of ideas, and it may now be assumed that ideas of contact have been an universal and original constant factor in human relations, and that they are so still.[1] The latter assumption is to be stressed, because we find that the ideas which lie beneath primitive taboo are still a vital part of human nature, though mostly emptied of their religious content; and also because, as we hold, ceremonies and etiquette such as still obtain, could not possess such vitality as they do unless there were a living psychological force behind them, such as we find in elementary ideas coming straight from functional processes.

These ideas are primitive, in each sense of the word, at whatever stage of culture they appear. They seem to go back in origin and character to that highly developed sensibility of all animal and even organised life, which forms at once a biological monitor and a safeguard for the whole organism in relation to its environment. From this sensibility there arise subjective ideas concerning the safety or danger of the environment, and in man we may suppose these subjective ideas as to his environment, and especially as to his fellow-men, to be the origin

[1] [An American student, A. J. Todd, *The Primitive Family as an Educational Agency* (1913), p. 16, adds: "I am disposed to refer both the parental and the social bond to some remote manifestation of contact pleasure. . . ."]

of his various expressions of avoidance or desire for contact.

Lastly it is to be observed that avoidance of contact is the most conspicuous phenomenon attaching to cases of taboo when its dangerous character is prominent. In taboo the connotation of "not to be touched" is the salient point all over the world, even in cases of permanent taboo such as belongs to Samoan and Maori chiefs, with whom no one dared come into contact, [and to the lowest caste in India, the "untouchables"]; and so we may infer the same aversion to be potential in all such relations.

In connection with the phenomena of ideation and with the next question, there comes in the familiar piece of elementary metaphysics which has played so great a part in religion from the days of primitive man, the idea of substance and accidents. The distinction is quite familiar to savages; they can tell you how the god eats only the essence of a sacrifice, leaving behind the properties of colour, shape, taste and the like, for the priest or worshippers. In East Central Africa the people give an offering of flour to the ancestral spirits when a person is ill. The spirits regale themselves with the "essence" of the flour.[1] Amongst the Yorubas, evil spirits are supposed to cause illness in young children. They enter them and eat the "spiritual" part of the children's food, so that they pine away.[2] The Galelas and Tobelorese of Halmahera hold that spirits eat the "essence" of food.[3] The Hill Dyaks place choice

[1] J. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 104.

[2] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), pp. 111, 113.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 67.

morsels before their gods, who extract the "essence" of the food.[1]

So with regard to man's ideas of his fellow-men. The visual image and similar appearances, such as a man's shadow, are his essence, soul or second-self, and the ideas a man forms of another's characteristics, are his properties. On the other hand, the reference of all the characteristics of a man to him, as so many predicates to one subject, forms a correlative method by which the soul or essence of a man is thought of. For instance, in the New Hebrides the word for soul connotes the essence of a man;[2] the Wetarese poetically liken the soul to the smell of a flower.[3] Here again we see the materialism of early thought; even "essence" is material and is sometimes visible. There is no distinction between the substantial nature of soul, a man's properties, physical and spiritual; magical influence, whether of man or spirit; the contagious properties of disease; the mystical character of taboo; the wholesome or deleterious influence of men and evil spirits—they are all alike material and transmissible.

Now it is this material transmissibility that makes contact of such importance, and it is transmission of properties, whether of nature, man, or spirits, that lies behind the avoidance or desire for contact.[4]

Potentially always and actually often, it is true of all men and conditions of men and natural objects, that their properties can be transmitted by all possible material

[1] H. Low, *Sarawak* (1848), p. 251.

[2] D. Macdonald, *Oceania* (1889), p. 180.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 453.

[4] [Cp. the rather fanciful elaboration of this view by Dr — Karutz, "Der Emanismus," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1913), xlv. 545-611.]

methods and even by *actio in distans*. For practical purposes we may speak of contagion, and in so far as the properties transmitted are evil, all contacts are contagion. The wide generalisation of early man of course covered real cases of infection of disease or transmission of strength, and the affirmative instances, as usual, helped to perpetuate the negative, though what Messrs Spencer and Gillen state of the Central Australians applies for all early peoples. In connection with the disease *Erkincha* and its contagion, the natives do not reason "from a strictly medical point of view ; their idea in a case of this kind is, that a man suffering from *Erkincha* conveys a magic evil influence, which they call *Arungquiltha*, to the woman, and by this means it is conveyed as a punishment to other men." This *Arungquiltha* is a typical example of the primitive ideas of contact, and may preface a set of cases which show the meaning and application of these ideas. The same people say when the sun is eclipsed that "*Arungquiltha* has got into it," this being an "evil or malignant influence, sometimes regarded as personal and at other times as impersonal." Here the idea is applied to a strange, unusual phenomenon. They have also a tradition of a thin, emaciated man ; "where he died arose a stone, the rubbing of which may cause emaciation in other people. This stone is charged with *Arungquiltha*, or evil influence." Again, there is a myth of an old man who plucked boils from his body, each of which turned into a stone. This group of stones is still to be seen and they are called stone-sores. Men who desire to harm others, hit these stones with spears which are then thrown in the direction of the victim. The spears carry away with them *Arungquiltha* from the stones, and this produces an eruption of painful boils on the victim. And similarly, any stones marking the spot

where men died from magical influence, are themselves credited with magical powers.[1]

This principle may be illustrated from Maori and Red Indian science. The latter say that "Nature has the property to transfuse the qualities of food, or of the objects presented to the senses, into men."[2] The former hold that anything placed in contact with a sacred object acquires the sacred nature of that object, and anything thus made sacred cannot be eaten or used for cooking.[3] "Uncleanness" attaches to mourners, enchanters, and murderers, amongst the Kaffirs. The murderer washes to remove the contagion of death, and the enchanter washes when he renounces his art.[4] This "uncleanness" is the contagious property of taboo and is not distinguished from "sacredness," whether in the case of kings, priests, Maori gentlemen, infants, women during pregnancy, child-birth and menstruation, boys and girls at puberty, or other especially taboo characters. The Polynesian word *parapara* means a sacred place, the first-fruits of fish, a tree, defiled or unclean from having touched sacred food; "*cf. para*, dross, sediments; *parapara*, dirt, soilure, stain; *parare*, food."[5] It is noticeable that Kaffir words for "uncleanness" connote "rubbing" and that which is "rubbed off."[6] Lucian, speaking of the sacred pigs of Hierapolis, the touch of which rendered one "unclean," says that some thought they were "unclean," others "sacred."[7] In other words, they

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 412, 441, 550, 552, 566.

[2] J. Adair, *The History of the American Indians* (1775), p. 133.

[3] E. Shortland, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand* (1851), pp. 292-294.

[4] H. Lichtenstein, *Travels in Southern Africa* (1812-1815), i. 257.

[5] E. Tregear, *The Maori-Polynesian Comparative Dictionary* (1891), *s.v.*

[6] J. L. Döhne, *A Zulu-Kafir Dictionary* (1857), *s.v.*

[7] Lucian, *De dea Syria*, 54.

were taboo. When lightning strikes a Kaffir kraal or individual or object, the persons connected therewith are "unclean." Animals struck by lightning are never eaten.[1]

Amongst the Malays "not only is the king's person considered sacred, but the sanctity of his body is believed to communicate itself to his regalia, and to slay those who break the royal taboos." Again, "the theory of the king as the divine man, is held perhaps as strongly in the Malay region as in any other part of the world, a fact which is strikingly emphasised by the alleged right of Malay monarchs to slay at pleasure without being guilty of a crime."[2] So with the materialised dignity of chiefs and the like persons. No one in Samoa dared to come in contact with a chief,[3] and in New Zealand such contact caused transmission of taboo.[4]

Again, in Melanesia, where we see ideas of taboo attaching to men generally, a fact which shows its derivation from subjective conceptions of a man's own importance and power, and in more primitive form, his egoistic caution, *mana*, which combines personal ability, influence, strength, and luck, is the regular term for any result of such, and is of a supernatural character. *Mana* comes from communication with spirits, and from eating human flesh. All men of any importance have large supplies of *mana*. To give a boy a start in the world a kind man will put his hand on the boy's head to impart the mysterious force.[5] [Chalmers describes how the Dyaks

[1] J. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (1858), pp. 86, 121.

[2] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 23.

[3] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-42* (1845), ii. 103.

[4] R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui* (1870), p. 165; E. Shortland, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand* (1851), pp. 292-294.

[5] R. H. Codrington, "Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia," *J.A.I.* (1881), x. 279, 285, 303; [*id.*, *The Melanesians* (1891), pp. 83 *et seq.*].

took "our hands in theirs, and tried to squeeze out the essence, which they rubbed over their bodies. Others brought their little children for us to touch them."][1] The transmission of "virtue" ends in the laying-on of hands, as it began in man's ideas connected with contact. The civilised man still subconsciously gains solace, comfort and strength from the contact of a friend, and, at the other end of the chain, the same is true of animals. In the Solomon Islands, again, inland people are thought to have more *mana* than coast people. When they go down to the coast they avoid spreading out their fingers, for to point the fingers at a man is to shoot him with a charm.[2] In this example we may note the extension of the idea that a man's qualities are transmitted by touch; the outstretched hand and spreading of the fingers signify "intention," and the hand is the organ of touch *par excellence*. The last religious phase of this idea is seen in the Roman Catholic gesture of benediction.

"*Badi* is the name given to the evil principle which, according to the view of Malay medicine-men, attends (like an evil angel) everything that has life, and inert objects also, for these are regarded as animate." It is also described as "the enchanting or destroying influence which issues from anything, *e.g.*, from a tiger which one sees, from a poison tree which one passes under, from the saliva of a mad dog, from an action which one has performed; the contagious principle of morbid matter." It is applied to "all kinds of evil influences or principles such as may have entered into a man who has unguardedly touched a dead animal or bird, from which

[1] H. L. Roth, *The Natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo* (1896), i. 218.

[2] R. H. Codrington, "Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia," *J.A.I.* (1881), x. 301.

the *badi* has not yet been expelled, or who has met the wild huntsman in the forest." There are one hundred and ninety of these "mischiefs." Dr Skeat compares the English word "mischief" in the phrase "it has the mischief in it." Illness is ascribed by the Malays to accidental contact with *badi*. A man also contracts *badi* when another practices magic on him by means of a wax image.[1] In Malay medicine neutralising ceremonies are used to destroy the evil principle, and also expulsory ceremonies to cast it out. The Malays also use counter-charms to neutralise the active principle of poison, and this is "extended to cover all cases where any evil principle (even for instance a familiar spirit) is believed to have entered the sick person's system."[2] Amongst the Arunta, when a man is ill "he will sometimes have a stone *churinga* belonging to his totem brought from the store-house. With the flint flake of his spear-thrower, he will scrape off some of the edge of the *churinga*, mix the dust with water and drink it, the mixture being supposed to be very strengthening. The idea evidently is, that in some way he absorbs part of the essence of the stone, thereby gaining strength, as it is endowed with the attributes of the individual whom it represents."[3] The Kurnai were afraid of white men and believed that their eyes possessed a supernatural power. One would say to another, "don't look, or he will kill you!" A white man could "flash death" upon a man. Death could only occur from accident, open violence or secret magic. The last was met by counter-charms. "Every individual, though doubtful

[1] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), pp. 427-430.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 410, 425.

[3] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 135.

of his own magic powers, has no doubt of about the possible powers of any other person. If the individual himself fails, he supposes that he is not strong enough. Nearly everyone carries a round black pebble of magic power. For instance, if it is buried with a man's excreta, that person receives the magic *bulk* in his intestines and dies. The touch of it is supposed to be highly injurious to any but its owner. It is believed that a *bulk* has the power of motion ; for instance, a man once saw a *bulk*, in the shape of a bright spark of fire, cross over a house. From all this we may infer that some secret influence passes from the magic substance to the victim." Further, the magic influence, "may, they suppose, be communicated from this to some other substance, as a throwing-stick, spear, or club. Death also occurred through a combination of sorcery and violence : this combination was called *barn*." It is clear from the above that subjective hate and malice, the influence or will of a person, is regarded as materialised and visible.[1]

The material character of these properties is evident in all cases, and the last quotation gives a remarkable instance of magical property or human "intention" being visible. [We shall have to consider the various modes of contagion in some detail, and it will be convenient first to survey rapidly some of these varieties.] The common method of curing illness by cupping, or sucking out the "bad" blood, as used by the people of the Kei Islands,[2] is scientific in a way, but not to be distinguished from other early methods. Some curious developments of the materialistic conceptions of contagion are these. The Laplanders attribute disease to spiritual

[1] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), pp. 248-252.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 419.

birds. They flew to the shaman (*noid*) and shook out of their feathers a multitude of poisonous insects, like lice, called magic flies, *lan*. If these flies fell on men or beasts, they brought sickness and other misfortunes. The *noids* carefully gathered up these insects, but never touched them with bare hands ; they kept them in boxes, using them to do injury.[1] This is a curious coincidence with the fact that germs of disease are known to be carried about by flies. They also used a magic axe, with which they touched people, and a disease thus caused could only be cured by the *noid* who caused it.[2] Australian sorcerers extract from their own bodies by passes and manipulations a magical essence called *boylya*, which they can make to enter the patient's body.[3] The East Central Africans practice counter-irritation by making incisions in which ashes and roots are rubbed. This is called "killing the disease."[4] These ideas have produced the "sucking cure," with which the "cupping" of the Kei Islanders,[5] may be compared, and the conception, such as is found in Australia, that pain in any part of the body is due to the presence of some foreign substance. The Central Australians not only project into a sick man crystals to counteract the evil influence, but extract things from his body by sleight-of-hand. Avengers carry *churinga* like those kept as sacred objects, filled with the souls of ancestors ; "they are supposed, as usual, to impart to them strength, courage, accuracy of aim, and also to render them invisible to their enemies,

[1] V. M. Mikhailovskii, "Shamanism in Siberia and European Russia," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 149.

[2] V. M. Mikhailovskii, *loc cit.*

[3] Sir E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture* (1903), ii. 146.

[4] J. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 104.

[5] [Above, i. 118.]

and in addition they act as charms to prevent their wearers being wounded." A man injured by an avenger was cured by a doctor extracting from his body a number of pieces of a *churinga*, which is used as the magical weapon, actually thrown. The stick has been "sung over" and is charged with magic and evil influence (*Arungquiltha*).[1]

Again, amongst the Maoris, a slave entering a sacred place (*wahi tapu*) had to take off his clothes first, else they would be rendered useless.[2] In this case we see that the sanctity of taboo is contagious, but does not agree with one of low rank. In Efate, one of the New Hebrides, the word *namim* means ceremonial "uncleanness." One sort is of death, another of child-birth. If a "sacred man" comes in contact with *namim*, it destroys his own "sacredness."[3] Again, amongst the modern Egyptians, if any one in a state of religious "uncleanness" enters a room where there is a person afflicted with ophthalmia, the incident aggravates the disease.[4] Many other cases of this cross-contagion could be mentioned. All the various sorts are the taboo force, while the fact that there are different varieties and that these sometimes cross, gives an opportunity of inferring their special origin. The Indians of Costa Rica, as we have noted before,[5] know two kinds of ceremonial "uncleanness," *nya* and *bu-ku-rú*. Death and its concomitants are *nya*. *Bu-ku-rú* is the more dangerous and can kill. The worst kind of *bu-ku-rú* is that of a woman in her first pregnancy. She then infects the whole neighbourhood. People think of it as an evil spirit or as a property acquired. Any one

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *op. cit.*, pp. 480, 486-488, 489, 531.

[2] E. Shortland, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand* (1851), p. 293.

[3] D. Macdonald, *Oceania* (1889), p. 181.

[4] E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptian* (1871), i. 333.

[5] [Above, i. 89.]

going from her house carries the infection and all deaths are considered to be due to her, the damages being paid by her husband. *Bu-ku-rú* is also found in new houses and places visited for the first time.[1] The Zulu word *unesisila* means "you have dirt" or "are dirty," that is to say, you have done or said something, or some one has said or done something to you, which has bespattered you with metaphorical filth. Mr Leslie compares the Scriptural "defile," and our expression "his hands are not clean." If a woman has been called the worst possible thing, that is, *omka ninazala*, which means "you will bear children to your father-in-law," she makes a great to-do; she goes to the hut of the person who used the phrase and kills an animal, which is eaten by old women or little children, but by none of marriageable age. The animal takes over the *insila* which has now left the woman who was abused.[2] The Zulus, again, use two kinds of "medicine," black and white. Black wipes off "the black," which causes a man to be disliked; white causes him to be "bright," and therefore liked. The black is drunk and the body washed with it. It is emetic and is vomited into a fire, and thus the "badness" is burnt and consumed. Or the contents of the stomach may be ejected on pathways, that others may walk over it, and take away the "filth" that is the cause of the offence. The "white" is thus used: if a man has been rejected by a girl, he adds to it something which she has worn next to her skin, especially beads. Then he drinks it after sprinkling it on his head and over his body.[3] Homeopathy is the principle of this method. We can

[1] W. M. Gabb, in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* (1875), p. 505.

[2] D. Leslie, *Among the Zulus and Amatongo* (1875), pp. 169, 174-175.

[3] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), pp. 142-143.

clearly see from this case how personal properties are regarded as transmissible.

In these miscellaneous examples there are combined many features of contact which will be developed hereafter,[1] and it will be noticed that these various "influences" are essentially of the kind which underlies the phenomena of taboo; whether they are ceremonial "uncleanness," evil influence of man or spirit, or "sacredness," each may be the property of the taboo character, either in its specialised form or as belonging to the ordinary individual. All are simply results of human characteristics, properties and states.

Personal properties are what others suppose them to be, according to their estimate of the person in question; or, on the other hand, they are what their possessor supposes them or himself to be. He believes that he can transmit himself or his properties to others, with results according to the estimate he holds of his character at the time, and either with or without "intention"; and his fellow-men also believe that he can transmit himself to them, with results according to their estimate of him. Thus, in love-charms we find that the lover believes that he can transmit his feelings, or rather himself, full of love as he is, to his mistress, an idea arising straight from animal contact and ideas about it; and in sorcery we find that men transmit their feelings of envy, hatred and malice to the person concerned. These ideas are justified to their holders by such phenomena of contact as are scientifically true. Accordingly, a man can transmit his strength, his ability and his personal influence, his crimes and his degradation, his splendour and his shame, voluntarily or involuntarily.

[1] [Below, Chapters VIII., IX.]

As illustrating the continuity of culture we may point out that similar ideas exist now, though considerably lightened of their crude religious materialism, which, however, is preserved in language. When we say that A and B cannot *abide* each other, we are at the bottom of such institutions as caste, club, clique, and such emotional attitudes as prejudice and insularity. We avoid the company of "publicans and sinners"; we say we do not wish to be *contaminated* by their presence; we speak of moral *influence* in terms which are still materialistic; we talk of being *poisoned* by a man or by a book. Such constant human ideas need only to be accentuated by religion to produce exactly the same results of subjective feeling which gave rise to the phenomena of social taboo.

Using the language of contagion, as more convenient, for primitive man does not distinguish between transmission of disease and transmission of all other states and properties, we find that practically every human quality or condition can be transferred to others. Where evil influence or dangerous properties are not differentiated, we have seen many cases of their contagion and infection. Very often the force of taboo, when thus vaguely conceived, has correspondingly vague [or generalised] results in transmission, such as sudden death, sickness or other supernatural visitations. Similar vague results follow the ill-wishes of an enemy, unless he specifies the effect he desires, but this will, of course, be as a rule sickness or death. This vagueness of result is naturally found most in the conception of the persons who receive the contagion, as they do not know the "intention," to use the term in its liturgical sense, of the dangerous person. [Let us now

consider the belief in the transmission or contagion of more specific states or qualities.]

Degradation, as is well known in caste countries, is contagious. Thus, in ancient India, a Brahmin became an outcast by using the same carriage or seat or by eating with an outcast.[1] The touch of an inferior still contaminates a high-caste Hindu,[2] [and we have already noted[3] the classic instance of the lowest caste, called "untouchables."] In Travancore, courtiers must cover the mouth with the right hand, lest their breath should pollute the king or some other superior. At the temples a low-caste must wear a broad bandage over his nose and mouth, that his breath may not pollute the idols.[4] The name of the Rodiya caste in Ceylon means "filth." No recognised caste could deal or hold intercourse with a Rodiya. Their contact was shunned as "pollution," a view in which they themselves acquiesced. On the approach of a traveller they would shout, to warn him to stop till they could get off the road and allow him to pass without risk of too close proximity to their persons. "The most dreadful of all punishments under the Kandyan dynasty was to hand over the offender, if a lady of high rank, to the Rodiyas. She was 'adopted' by the latter thus: a Rodiya took *betel* from his own mouth, placed it in hers, and after this till death her degradation was indelible. As if to demonstrate that within the lowest depths of degradation there may exist a lower still, there are two races of outcasts in Ceylon who are abhorred

[1] *The Laws of Manu*, xi. 181.

[2] W. Ward, *A View of the History, Literature, and Religion of the Hindoos* (1817-1820), ii. 149; H. T. Colebrooke, "The Religious Ceremonies of the Hindus," *Asiatick Researches* (1801), vii. 232-311.

[3] [Above, i. 111.]

[4] S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore* (1883), p. 129.

and avoided, even by the Rodiyas." The latter would tie up their dogs, to prevent them prowling in search of food to the dwellings of these wretches.[1] In Burma, a man may be defiled by sitting or eating with a low-caste Sandala.[2] The black Jews of Loango are so despised that no one will eat with them.[3] In Egypt, the Jews are regarded as so unclean by the Muslims that their blood would defile a sword, and therefore they are never beheaded.[4]

Dulness can be transmitted; thus the Red Indians will not eat animals of a gross quality, because such food conveys "dulness" to the system;[5] the Indians of Equador believe that eating "heavy" meats produces unwieldiness.[6] Timidity can be transferred, as amongst the Dyaks, whose young men are forbidden to eat venison, because it would make them timid as deer;[7] the Hottentots will not eat the flesh of hares, because it would make them faint-hearted.[8] Stupidity, according to the people of Morocco, is the chief characteristic of the hyaena. A dull man is said to have eaten the brains of a hyaena. A woman can make her husband stupid by giving him hyaena meat.[9] Weakness is transmissible; amongst the Barea, man and wife seldom share a bed. The reason they give is "that the breath of the wife

[1] Sir J. E. Tennent, *Ceylon* (1860), i. 188-191.

[2] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde* (1834-1835), i. 173.

[3] A. Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an die Loanga-Küste* (1874-1875), i. 278.

[4] E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (1871), ii. 346.

[5] J. Adair, *The History of the American Indians* (1775), p. 133.

[6] A. Simson, "Notes on the Záparos," *J.A.I.* (1878), vii. 503.

[7] S. St John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East* (1862), i. 186.

[8] T. Hahn, *Tsuni-Goam* (1881), p. 106.

[9] A. Leared, *Morocco and the Moors* (1876), p. 304.

weakens her husband."[1] Effeminacy is transmissible; amongst the Omahas, if a boy plays with a girl he is dubbed "hermaphrodite";[2] in the Wiraijuri tribe, boys are reproved for playing with girls—the culprit is taken aside by an old man, who solemnly extracts from his legs some "strands of the woman's apron" which have got in.[3] Pain, also, can be transmitted or transferred; thus the Australians apply a heated spear-thrower to the cheek of one who is suffering from toothache, and then throw it away, believing that the toothache is transferred to it.[4] In old Greek folklore, if one who had been stung by a scorpion sat on an ass, the pain was supposed to be transferred from him to the ass.[5]

The taboo state resulting from sin and crime has material properties.[6] At the purification ceremonies of the Cherokees, they threw their old clothes into the river, supposing thus their impurities to be removed.[7] Similarly the Incas shook their clothes for the same purpose, and passed the hands over head and face, arms and legs, as if washing. It was done to drive evil and maladies away.[8] At the installation of a king in the Sandwich Islands, the priest struck him on the back with a sacred branch by way of purifying him from all defilement and guilt he may have contracted.[9] Consequently

[1] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien* (1864), p. 526.

[2] J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1884 for 1881-1882), iii. 266.

[3] A. W. Howitt, "Some Australian Ceremonies of Initiation," *J.A.I.* (1884), xiii. 448.

[4] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1881), p. 59.

[5] *Geoponica*, xiii. 9, xv. 1.

[6] [Cp. E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), i. 52 *et seq.*]

[7] Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), ix. 128.

[8] Garcilasso de la Vega, *First Part of the Royal Commentaries of the Yncas* (1869-1871), ii. 228 *et seq.*

[9] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), iii. 110.

these are transmissible by contagion. Thus in East Central Africa, when a wife has been guilty of unchastity, her husband will die if he taste any food she has salted; when preparing his food, she asks a little girl to put the salt in it. A guilty wife may be forgiven by her husband, but in this case he cannot live with the faithless one till a third party has been with her.[1] A Brahmin embraces the Rajah of Travancore, undertaking to bear his sins and diseases.[2] The idea is well brought out in the familiar practice of "sin-eating." It is well known that the highest religions have found it difficult, and in view of the materialism of human thought not altogether desirable, to rise beyond a material conception of "sin." The savage conceives of the results of sin, such as breaking of taboo, as material, and clinging to his person, and at both ends of the chain of culture, sin is washed away by water, and can be transmitted by "contagion" in early culture, by "influence" in later.

Early man is only too well aware of the contagion and infection of certain sickness and diseases. Of sickness we need no instances, but of the interesting fact that death not only causes sickness but is in itself contagious, we may cite illustrations. Beginning with the correlation of evil spirits and dangerous human properties, we find that where spirits are thought of, the fear is that others may be attacked by them in the same way as the dead man. They are naturally supposed to hang about their quarry,[3] and often the dead man is identified with the angel of death who killed him. In Halmahera, after a

[1] D. Macdonald, *Africana* (1882), i. 173; J. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 110.

[2] S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore* (1883), p. 136.

[3] [Cp. Sir J. G. Frazer, "Certain Burial Customs as Illustrative of the Primitive Theory of the Soul," *J.A.I.* (1886), xv. 64 *et seq.*; E. Westermarck, *op. cit.*, ii. 303 *et seq.*]

death, fire is set round the house to keep the evil spirits from the body.[1] In Cambodia, a dead body is carried away feet foremost that it may not see the house, in which event other sicknesses and other deaths would result.[2] Amongst the Yorubas, death is generally attributed to witchcraft. Enquiry is made whether any other member of the family is threatened with the like fate, and also whether the soul of the dead is likely to be further molested by the evil spirits.[3] The Navajos ascribe death to the devil, *Chinde*, who remains about the dead man. Those who bury him, protect their bodies from the evil influence by smearing themselves with tar.[4] The Kamchadales abandon the cabin in which a man died, because the judge of the underworld had been there and might cause the death of others. Those who buried a corpse feared being pursued by death, and to avoid him they took certain precautions.[5] Amongst the Clallams and Twanas there is a superstitious fear about going near the dead body, for fear the evil spirit who killed the man may kill them also.[6] Here we see how the idea of the contagion of death is connected with evil spirits. Men fear that they may meet with the same fate as the dead man. Thus amongst the Koosa Kaffirs there is a general fear that illness or misfortune may fall upon

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 84.

[2] É. Aymonier, "Note sur les coutumes et croyances superstitieuses des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine Française* (1883), vi. 202.

[3] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), p. 155.

[4] H. C. Yarrow, "A Further Contribution to the Study of the Mortuary Customs of the North American Indians," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1881 for 1879-1880), i. 123.

[5] J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie* (1776), pp. 91-92.

[6] H. C. Yarrow, *op. cit.*, i. 176.

others if a dying person is not removed from the kraal. From the same motive if they see a person drowning, or in danger of his life in any way, particularly if he should utter a scream of terror, they always run away from him.[1] The latter idea is world-wide[2] and obtains amongst ourselves.

Passing to transmission of the state or influence of death, we find that "to prevent death from entering" the food and drink iron used to be put in them by the Northern Scots. Whisky has been spoiled by neglect of this.[3] At a death all members of a Zulu kraal eat "medicine" to protect themselves from evil influences.[4] When the king's mother died the potentate was begirt with charms "to keep the evil from him."[5] Amongst the Bechuanas, death is believed liable to come upon all the cattle when a widow is mourning her husband.[6] In the Babar Islands, after a burial, no one may go back to his house until he has washed his hands and eaten some food.[7] In the Aru Islands, the humours of a decaying corpse are used sometimes to make a man ill, by the help of the soul of the dead man. During the first night after getting rid of the dead body, no one will sleep in the house for fear of being made sick by meeting the soul of the dead man in their dreams.[8] In Samoa, those who attended upon a dead person were careful not to handle any food, and for days were fed by others, as if

[1] H. Lichtenstein, *Travels in Southern Africa* (1812-1815), i. 258.

[2] [Cp. L. Lévy-Bruhl, *Primitive Mentality* (1923), pp. 279 *et seq.*]

[3] W. Gregor, *Notes on the Folklore of the North-East of Scotland* (1881), p. 206.

[4] D. Leslie, *Among the Zulus and Amatongas* (1875), p. 197.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 252.

[6] J. P. Meerusen, "Customs and Superstitions among the Betshuana," *Folk-Lore Journal* (Cape Town, 1879), i. 34.

[7] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 360.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 267.

they were helpless infants; while the dead body was in the house, no food was eaten inside, the family taking their meals out of doors.[1] The Ilavars of Travancore ascribe "pollution" to the house after death.[2] The Greenlanders believe that if a man when whale-hunting wears a dirty dress, especially one that is contaminated by touching a corpse, the whales will retire.[3] The Northern Indians were "unclean" after murder; all concerned in it could not cook any kind of victuals for themselves or others. They could not drink out of any other dish, or smoke out of any other pipe than their own, and none other would drink or smoke out of theirs. For a long time they would not kiss their wives and children.[4] Among the Navajos of New Mexico and Arizona the person who touches or carries the dead body takes off his clothing afterwards, and washes his body before mingling with the living.[5] The ceremonial "uncleanness," then, so generally ascribed to the dead, is the property of taboo, and is based on the ideas of contact which underlie social taboo.

Hence the custom of destroying the personal property of the dead. The Zulus burn this "because they are afraid to wear anything belonging to a dead man."[6] Amongst the Central Eskimo, "when a child dies, women who carried it in their hands must throw their jackets away if the child has urinated on them."[7] The Greenlanders

[1] G. Turner, *Samoa a Hundred Years Ago and Long Before* (1884), p. 145.

[2] S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore* (1883), p. 90.

[3] D. Cranz, *The History of Greenland* (1820), i. 120.

[4] S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean* (1796), pp. 204-205.

[5] H. C. Yarrow, *op. cit.*, i. 123.

[6] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), p. 13.

[7] F. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1888 for 1884-1885), vi. 612.

throw out of the house everything belonging to the dead man, or else they would be polluted and their lives unfortunate ; the danger remains until the smell of the corpse has passed away.[1] Here, as in other examples, there is seen the obvious connection of the idea of contagion with smell. Another reason for this destruction of property, namely, to provide the dead man with utensils and furniture in the next world, is well known, and often combines with the present explanation, though probably it is later in origin.

Another result is the common practice of deserting the house or destroying it after sickness or death. A common reason for this practice in sickness is to mislead the evil spirits by removing the sick man to another house. With this may be compared the custom of pretending that the sick man is dead, by performing funeral rites over a dummy corpse. Burial places are notoriously of evil omen, because they are infected by death and by the dead. The Gorngai and Tungu are afraid to visit the places where the dead lie buried for fear the spirits may make them ill.[2] The ground is often regarded as a good conductor of evil and disease. In Tenimber and Timorlaut strangers are not buried, for fear that sickness may thus spread over the country.[3] From this idea comes the common objection to burial among early peoples, no less than in modern times when cremation is becoming fashionable. The Masai do not bury people, because, as they say, the body would poison the soil.[4] Exactly the same practice and belief are found in East

[1] D. Cranz, *op. cit.*, i. 217.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 271.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 306.

[4] J. Thomson, *Through Masai Land* (1887), pp. 211, 259.

Central Africa.[1] This idea, combined with fear of ghosts, has helped to form the relatively late phenomena of ancestral and Chthonian hierology. It is also one factor in the formation of the common idea that the ground is dangerous. We shall not, perhaps, be wrong in adding the multifarious dangers in the shape of snakes, scorpions and other things that creep upon the ground. On this hypothesis we may explain the rule that people in certain taboo states may not touch the ground, because there is the abode of evil, material and spiritual. Combined with this is the other side of the idea, namely, that "virtue" is apt to be conducted into the soil by contact, as has been worked out by Sir James Frazer.[2] As to spirits there residing, in Ethiopia you should never throw fluid on the ground, lest you hurt the dignity of some unseen elf.[3] The natives of Kola and Kobroor fear the spirit who lives in the ground.[4] In spiritualistic sittings held by Guiana sorcerers, the rule is that one must not put one's feet to the ground, for the spirits are swarming there.[5]

From the belief in the contagion and infection of death, combined with the belief in and fear of the ghosts of the dead, the origin of which we would explain on the lines used above,[6] in the account of personal agents, arises the taboo upon mourners, who are, from their proximity, in danger from the dead, and also dangerous to others. We would also attribute to this contagion of death the rule of the ancient Romans that *patrimi* and *matrimi* only,

[1] J. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 113.

[2] Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), x. 1 *et seq.*

[3] Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), ii. 296.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

[5] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana* (1883), p. 335. [For the worship of earth, see, *e.g.*, Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Worship of Nature* (1926), i. 316-440.]

[6] [Above, i. 112 *et seq.*]

boys and girls whose parents both lived, might be acolytes in ceremonies.[1]

Turning to the beneficent side of the taboo state, where the individual is benevolent : he can transmit his beneficence or good qualities, and others believe that they can receive them from him, with the same limitations as are connected with "intention."[2] Rajah Brooke was regarded by the Dyaks, because of what he had done for them, as a supernatural being. He was believed "to shed influence over them." Whenever he visited a village, the people used to bring some of the padi seed they were going to sow for him to make it productive ; and women bathed his feet, preserving the water to put on the fields and make them fertile.[3] Here is the vague sort of beneficent influence materially transmitted. We have seen[4] that the Melanesian *mana*, which is a combination of a man's character, ability, influence and power combined, can be transferred by the laying-on of hands.[5] Amongst love-charms, the transmission by the lover of his loving qualities, of himself impregnated with love, to his mistress, to inspire her with affection, is world-wide. Thus in European folk-customs a lover applies a piece of his hair, drops of his blood or sweat, or water in which he has washed his hands, to the garments of the girl whose affections he desires. In this kind of thing we reach down to the origin of ideas of contact in physiological thought. Similarly, friendship and friendly feelings are

[1] [Tacitus, *Historia*, iv. 53 ; Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, xxxvii. 3.]

[2] [Above, i. 122.]

[3] H. Low, *Sarawak* (1848), pp. 247, 259.

[4] [Above, i. 115-116.]

[5] R. H. Codrington, "Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia," *J.A.I.* (1881), x. 303.

transmissible, as will be seen in the ceremonies common at making peace or consolidating friendship.[1]

Again, world-wide customs attest the belief that properties such as strength, courage, swiftness and the like, can be transmitted by contact with those possessing them, or by assimilating separable parts of such persons. Hence, as is at last becoming well known, the origin and chief meaning of cannibalism. The flesh and blood of a man are, by a natural fallacy, regarded as the best means for transmission of his properties. The flesh of a slain enemy is eaten and his blood drunk by the savage in order to acquire his strength and courage.[2] The Bechuanas have a solemn ceremony of eating the flesh of an enemy killed, "following the ancient superstition that eating human flesh inspires courage, and by degrees renders the warrior invincible. So far from liking it, they feel abhorrence, and yield to it from superstition."[3] Before battle, the Zulus "ceremoniously eat cattle to get their qualities, that they may be brave."[4] The Amaxosa drink the gall of an ox to make themselves fierce.[5] The notorious Matuana drank the gall of thirty chiefs, believing it would render him strong.[6] Many peoples, for instance the Yorubas, believe that the "blood is the life."[7] The New Caledonians eat

[1] [Below, i. 294-296.]

[2] [Cp. E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), ii. 553-581, with the references in ii. 553 *n.*[1]; J. A. MacCulloch, "Cannibalism," *E.R.E.* (1910), iii. 194-209. For a possible interpretation of certain forms of cannibalism as the preservation of the life within the kin, see Sir J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy* (1910), i. 74-75.]

[3] H. Lichtenstein, *Travels in Southern Africa* (1812-1815), ii. 290.

[4] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), p. 438.

[5] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), p. 216.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 216.

[7] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), p. 68.

slain enemies to acquire courage and strength.[1] The flesh of a slain enemy is eaten in Timorlaut to cure impotence.[2] The people of Halmahera drink the blood of slain enemies in order to become brave.[3] In Amboina, warriors drink the blood of enemies they have killed to acquire their courage.[4] The people of Celebes drink the blood of enemies to make themselves strong.[5] The natives of the Dieri and neighbouring tribes will eat a man and drink his blood in order to acquire his strength; the fat is rubbed on sick people.[6] The Pinya, or armed band, of the Dieri, by whom offences are punished, after putting a man to death, wash their weapons, "and getting all the gore and flesh adhering to them off, mix it with some water; a little is given to each to swallow, and they believe that thereby they will be inspired with courage and strength. The fat of the murdered man is cut off and wrapped round the weapons of all the old men."[7]

The idea is further generalised amongst the natives of Central Australia. "When starting on an avenging expedition or *Atninga*, every man of the party drinks some blood, and also has some spurted over his body, so as to make him what is called *uchuilima*, that is, lithe

[1] J. Garnier, *Voyage autour du monde : La Nouvelle Calédonie* (1901), p. 347.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 279.

[3] *Id.*, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 86.

[4] *Id.*, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 52.

[5] *Id.*, "De Topantunuasu of Oorsprongkelijke Volkstammen van Centraal Selebes," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* (1886), xxxv. 90.

[6] S. Gason, "The Tribes, Dieyerie, Auminie, Yandrawontha, Yarawuarka, Pilladopa," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 172; "The Habits, etc., of the Aborigines in district of Powell's Creek, Northern Territory of South Australia," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 178, 179.

[7] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), ii. 53.

and active. The elder men indicate from whom the blood is to be drawn, and the men so selected must not decline, though the amount drawn from a single individual is often very great; indeed, we have known of a case in which blood was taken from a young and strong man until he dropped down from sheer exhaustion."[1] In the Luritcha tribe of Central Australia, "young children are sometimes killed and eaten, and it is not an infrequent custom, when a child is in weak health, to kill a younger and healthy one, and then to feed the weakling on its flesh, the idea being that this will give to the weak child the strength of the stronger one."[2] In Tasmania, a man's blood was often administered as a healing draught.[3]

Similarly the flesh and blood of animals are taken to acquire their characteristics.[4] Hottentots will not eat the flesh of hares, for fear it might make them timid, but they will eat a lion's flesh and drink its blood, in order to get its courage and strength.[5] In Morocco it is believed that eating lion's flesh makes cowards brave. On the same principle ants are given to lethargic persons, an excellent practical application of the proverb. If a woman meets an hyaena she becomes stupid, for the hyaena is the most stupid of animals; of a dull man one says, "he has eaten the brains of an hyaena." A woman will sometimes administer such brain-sauce to her husband, who thus becomes stupid, and her ascendancy

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 461.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 475.

[3] J. Bonwick, *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians* (1870), p. 89.

[4] [Cp. Porphyry, *De abstinentia ab animalibus necandis*, iv. 16; Homer, *Hymn to Demeter*, 370; Sir J. G. Frazer, *Folk-lore in the Old Testament* (1918), ii. 423-424; *id.*, *Totemism and Exogamy* (1910), iv. 6.]

[5] T. Hahn, *Tsuni-Goam* (1881), p. 106.

over him is thus rendered complete.[1] Among the Motu, boys eat pigs and other animals to acquire their strength.[2] The men of Buru[3] and of the Aru Islands[4] eat dogs to become bold and nimble.

Every part of a man's body is regarded by primitive science as impregnated with his properties; but such parts are especially so considered which themselves are held to have a special connection with the life and soul; and these are chiefly important organs and centres. From each and any of these parts of the organism, transmission of properties can be effected with beneficent or maleficent results according to circumstances or the subjective estimate held at the time. Instructive examples are found in folk-medicine.[5] Various modes of transmission have appeared already. Others will be seen in the following examples. The most certain method of acquiring properties is by eating and drinking, but any mode of contact will suffice, and in such modes primitive thought includes sight, proximity and similar connections; "intention," even, can form the link by *actio in distans*. We have also seen cases of transmission by the most obvious vehicle, flesh and blood, and we now proceed to pass others in review. The people of Wetar make special use of the blood and the head of slain enemies to acquire their properties.[6] The head is naturally supposed sacred by most peoples, the Siamese[7]

[1] A. Leared, *Morocco and the Moors* (1876), pp. 281, 304.

[2] J. Chalmers, *Pioneering in New Guinea* (1887), p. 166.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 10.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 262.

[5] See W. G. Black, *Folk-Medicine* (1883), *passim*.

[6] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 445.

[7] S. de La Loubère, *Du royaume de Siam* (1691), i. 175.

and the Maoris, for instance; if a Maori touched his head he had to put his fingers to his nose "and snuff up the sanctity which they had acquired by the touch, and thus restore it to the part from which it was taken." Also he could not blow the fire, for his breath being sacred communicated sanctity to the fire, and anyone using it for cooking might die.[1] The Malays still regard the head as "sacred."[2] A New Zealand chief would eat the eyes of a dead enemy to improve himself.[3] In the island Wetar, the men during war eat the tongue, heart and liver of slain enemies, believing that in these parts the soul resides. They also drink their blood mixed with *kalapa* water.[4] The Kamilaroi ate the heart and liver of a brave man in order to obtain his courage.[5] In Uganda, the liver is regarded as the seat of the soul, and by eating liver one may improve one's powers.[6] The Shiré Highlanders eat the heart of a brave man to acquire his courage.[7]

Another mode of transmission is rubbing the stuff into the skin, or anointing.[8] Australians rub themselves with the fat of a slain enemy, believing that his qualities are thus transferred to themselves, they rub sick persons also with it. Human fat is used to grease weapons, which thus gain additional power.[9] The fat of a pig is

[1] R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui* (1870), p. 165.

[2] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 43.

[3] R. Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 352.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 445.

[5] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), p. 160.

[6] R. W. Felkin, "Notes on the For Tribe of Central Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* (1886), xiii. 218.

[7] J. Buchanan, *The Shiré Highlands* (1885), p. 138.

[8] [Cp. A. E. Crawley, "Anointing," *E.R.E.* (1908), i. 549-554.]

[9] R. B. Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria* (1878), i. 202, ii. 289, 313; "The Habits, etc., of the Aborigines in district of Powell's Creek, Northern Territory of

melted and poured over and rubbed into the body of the Andamanese boy at puberty; this "makes him strong." We may compare such cases as that in the Homeric hymn, where Demeter anointed Demophoon with ambrosia, "breathed sweetness over him, and held him in her arms" and "he waxed like a god."[1] Another method of the Andamanese is mere pressure of the animal on to the person's body.[2] Or again, a powder may be made of the substance. The Yorubas sacrifice a slave to ensure success in war. The heart is made into a powder, which, mingled with rum, is sold to those who "wish to be endowed with courage." They drink this, believing that the "heart is the seat of courage, and the qualities with which it is inspired can be taken into the system."[3] Amongst the North American Indians the genital organs of any beast killed are eaten by men and boys; they must not be cut with an edge tool, but are torn to pieces with the teeth. They believe that if a dog should eat any part of them, it would have the same effect on their success in hunting that a woman crossing their hunting track at an improper period would have. The same ill-success is supposed to attend them if a woman eat any of those parts.[4] Primitive thought by a natural fallacy attributes strength to these parts and their secretions, just as it attributes life to

South Australia," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 178; E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 315; [J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1891), p. 68].

[1] *Hymn to Demeter*, 236; [cp. Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, III. ii. 1; Lucian, *Lucius*, 12].

[2] E. H. Man, "The Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands," *J.A.I.* (1883), xii. 134.

[3] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), p. 69.

[4] S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean* (1796), p. 319.

blood. The Central Australians administer blood from the genital organs in cases of severe sickness.[1] The people of Mowat believe that the penis of a great warrior slain in battle possesses "virtue," and it is therefore worn by the victor to increase his strength.[2] In South Africa, during a protracted war, the soldiers are frequently "doctored" in order to stimulate their courage. The heart, liver and testicles of the slain enemies are made into a broth, which is taken internally and also used as a war-paint. The Woloffs carry the prepuce, removed at circumcision, as an amulet, believing that it will make them strong in procreation.[3]

Here may be mentioned a common case of primitive argument from analogy, the idea, namely, that any object resembling a part of the body, may possess the virtues of such part. In this is probably to be found the origin of the beliefs concerning beans and vegetables of similar shape. Their obvious resemblance to the *testes* is perhaps the ultimate explanation of the well-known taboo, as enforced by the Pythagoreans. The frequent prohibition against the eating of snakes, eels and similarly shaped animals, has a similar origin.

To proceed with the use made of various parts of the body, in Devonshire and Scotland, to cure whooping-cough, a hair from the child's head is put between slices of bread and butter and given to a dog. If the dog coughs while eating it, the whooping-cough is transferred

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 464.

[2] E. Beardmore, "The Natives of Mowat, Daudai, New Guinea," *J.A.I.* (1890), xix. 462.

[3] A. T. de Rochebrune, "Etude morphologique, physiologique et ethnographique sur la femme et l'enfant dans la race Oulove," *Revue d'Anthropologie* (1881), 2nd ser., iv. 292.

to the animal and the child is cured.[1] In Devonshire you can give a neighbour ague by burying a dead man's hair under his threshold.[2] Pliny mentions the use of hair to cure various sicknesses.[3] The Kaffir charm, *isiko lobulunga*, consists in tying the long hair drawn from the tail of a cow round one's neck, to prevent any kind of evil. "Each family has certain cattle set apart for this purpose, and which are to a certain extent considered sacred." When a woman is married, she takes with her the ox which has been consecrated for her protection, and from the tail of which the *lobulunga* or long hair was taken which is tied round her neck.[4] After circumcision, a Dieri boy has wrapped round his waist a rope of hair taken from the heads of the men, women and children.[5] Amongst the Central Australians the use of the hair of others is a developed system; every one is entitled to acquire hair from some one else, and the claim is arranged according to relationship. The intention of this use of hair is shown clearly by the following practice. The natives, when "avenging blood," "wear round the waist the *kirra-urkna* or girdle made from the hair which has been cut from a warrior after his death, and which is supposed to add to the wearer all the warlike virtues of the dead man."[6]

Amongst many peoples bones are used for healing diseases and preventing danger, and for causing such. The idea is that human virtue permanently resides in them. Amongst the extinct Tasmanians the ashes of a

[1] W. G. Black, *Folk-Medicine* (1883), p. 35.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 27. [3] Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, xxviii. 20.

[4] J. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (1858), pp. 92-93.

[5] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), ii. 56.

[6] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 480, 539.

burnt body, human bones attached to the parts affected, a child's skull hung round the neck, were all efficacious means to stop the progress of disease.[1] In order to be invulnerable in war, the men of Timorlaut wash in holy water and use amulets. By way of protection in battle, they use the *epistropheus* of a slain enemy. The water in which it is placed is drunk and the body washed with it.[2] Pliny mentions the custom according to which the first tooth shed by a child was worn as an amulet, and protected him from pain; sometimes this cured tooth-ache.[3]

Finger-nail clippings are used in folk-medicine to transmit strength. Human skin, flesh and "mummy" are used for the same purpose.[4] The Manicheans sprinkled their eucharistic bread with human semen, a custom followed by the Albigenses.[5] Human semen, as medicine, is used by many peoples, as by the Australians, who believe it an infallible remedy for severe illness.[6] It is so used in European folk-custom, where we also find it used as a love-charm,[7] on the principle of transmission of qualities.[8] [Dr Ellis, quoting a statement of John Hunter that semen, "when held for some time in the mouth, it produces a warmth similar to spices, which

[1] J. G. Bourke, *Scatologic Rites of all Nations* (1891), pp. 378-379.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 298.

[3] Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, xxviii. 7, 12.

[4] J. G. Bourke, *op. cit.*, pp. 256, 346-347; Pliny, *op. cit.*, xxviii. 10.

[5] B. Picart, *Cérémonies et coutumes religieuses* (1723), viii. 79; [cp. F. W. H. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendländischer Kirche* (1851), p. 660].

[6] P. Beveridge, *The Aborigines of Victoria and Riverina* (1889), p. 55; J. G. Bourke, *loc. cit.*; [W. E. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West Central Queensland Aborigines* (1897), p. 174].

[7] J. G. Bourke, *op. cit.*, pp. 343, 355.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 219; [cp. L. Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science* (1923), i. 369; ii. 332, 345].

lasts sometime,"[1] observes: "Possibly this fact first suggested that semen might, when ingested, possess valuable stimulant qualities. . . ."[2] But it seems hardly likely that savage man should have made the experiment sufficiently frequently to have reached such a conclusion; the facts can be more easily explained along the lines here suggested.] Menstrual blood is also used in medicine and as a love-charm.[3] Pliny states that if door-posts are touched with menstrual fluid, all spells of witchcraft are dissolved.[4] The menstrual fluid is used in Angola to cure bites of centipedes.[5] The Ovaherero believe that to add one's urine, even unintentionally, to the food of another, bewitches that person and does him grievous harm.[6] Urine is very commonly used in folk-medicine.[7] The Kaffirs hold it a capital crime to ease nature in a cattlefold, as it pollutes the water.[8] In this case we see the deleterious aspect of a taboo substance, and the action of disgust.

Again, the smell of a man contains his properties. Thus when a Central Australian black-fellow is eating, he must take care that certain relatives by marriage do not see what he is eating, lest they should spoil it by what is called *Equilla timma*, which means "projecting their smell into it." Should a man eat meat which has been killed or seen by any of these persons, the food would

[1] J. Hunter, *Essays and Observations on Natural History, Anatomy, Physiology, Psychology, and Geology* (1861), i. 189.

[2] H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1912), [v.], 172; as to the alleged properties of semen, see M. C. C. Stopes, *Contraception* (1923), pp. 21, 76, 208.

[3] J. G. Bourke, *op. cit.*, p. 354.

[4] Pliny, *op. cit.*, xxviii. 24.

[5] J. G. Bourke, *op. cit.*, p. 351. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 376.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 300, 338; E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 300.

[8] H. Lichtenstein, *Travels in Southern Africa* (1812-1815), i. 289.

disagree with him and he would sicken and suffer severely.[1]

Human qualities are transmitted by the breath. Chiquito doctors fill themselves with dainties, chickens, hens and partridges, etc., to render their health wholesomer and stronger, for blowing the body of patients.[2] Healing by breath is a common idea in the East.[3] Blowing on a person is a common method of bewitching him. A Maori could not blow the fire, for his breath being sacred, communicated his sanctity to it, and someone might use the fire for cooking and be thus injured.[4] Health is transmitted by breathing by the Columbians.[5]

Pliny notes that the Greeks used the scrapings of the bodies of athletes to cure rheumatism, sprains and uterine troubles.[6] Folk-medicine has examples of the transference of disease by putting one's sweat on a dog.[7] The Nubians "suppose it will give them strength to apply the sweat of their horses to their own bodies. After a ride they scrape off the sweat from their horses' backs with the hand, and rub it about their persons as if it were one of their ordinary greasy ointments. A horse is not an unclean animal, and cannot defile." These people have a practice which shows well the idea of transmission of properties. Before the tongue of any animal is eaten, the tip is cut off; on human analogy

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 469.

[2] M. Dobrizhoffer, *Historia de Abiponibus* (1784), ii. 263.

[3] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1910), p. 430; Sir R. F. Burton, *The Arabian Nights* (1885-1886), v. 30.

[4] R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui* (1870), p. 165.

[5] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America* (1875-1876), i. 286.

[6] Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, xxviii. 18.

[7] J. G. Bourke, *op. cit.*, p. 349.

they believe that "here is the seat of curses and ill-wishes."[1]

Some Queensland tribes used to flay a slain enemy and preserve his skin as powerful "medicine." They would cover their patients with it as with a blanket.[2] This case forms a link with those in which a man's garments contain his properties, and accordingly can transmit them through the bodily exhalations remaining therein. In early thought a man's dress is a real part of him, and can be used as a substitute for him.[3] Thus in Tonga, when the office of high priest was vacant, his dress was put on his chair, and yams were offered to it. It was supposed to be an exact equivalent.[4] The Zulus call in the "lightning-doctor" to avert hail-storms. If he is not at home, they take his blanket, and spread it out before the storm. It is regarded as an equivalent.[5] On the principle of transmission the Mikado's clothes, if worn by any one else, would cause the wearer pain and produce swellings. His taboo "sanctity" was such that his eating and drinking vessels were destroyed after being used once; any one eating from them would be seriously injured.[6]

Transmission of properties for good and evil, and assimilation of various kinds, one effected by eating food which a person has touched with his hands or any part of his body, or by eating with him or in his presence, or even by using the same kind of food and drink. This is a large subject and will be separately

[1] G. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa* (1873), ii. 326-327.

[2] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), p. 227.

[3] [Cp. A. E. Crawley, "Dress," *E.R.E.* (1912), v. 51-52.]

[4] S. S. Farmer, *Tonga and the Friendly Islands* (1855), p. 130.

[5] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), p. 278.

[6] F. Caron, "Account of Japan," *in* J. Pinkerton, *A General Collection of Voyages and Travels* (1808-1814), vii. 613.

discussed later.[1] The connection of saliva with eating leads up to the next vehicle of transmission. The Masai asked Joseph Thomson to spit on them, believing his saliva to "have sovereign virtues." With these people spitting is a regular "expression of goodwill," and is customary at meetings and partings.[2] A curious instance, showing how this method of transmission can be extended, is found amongst the Zulus. The *Amatongo* (ancestral spirits) cause men to be sick; if a man dreams of one, the "doctor" tells him to spit out the spittle which is in his mouth when he dreams, and throw it behind his back; should he look behind him, the dream will recur.[3] The practice of using saliva for healing purposes and for love-charms is very common.[4] The transmission or projection of hatred, contempt and other feelings by spitting is world-wide, and leads back to an animal practice. To spit in a man's face is the grossest form of insult throughout mankind,[5] and, like similar acts of animals, it is physically the modification of a blow, as is all contact itself.

Woman's milk is often used in folk-medicine to transmit health and strength. Conversely, a Bondei infant may not drink any milk but that of relatives, for fear of *usawi* witchcraft;[6] and the Garos abhor milk as "diseased matter."[7] A similar feature of human contagion is seen in the Kaffir custom. Milk is the

[1] [Below, Ch. VII, i. 182 *et seq.*]

[2] J. Thomson, *Through Masai Land* (1887), pp. 165-166.

[3] H. Callaway, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

[4] J. G. Bourke, *Scatologic Rites of all Nations* (1891), p. 348.

[5] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), pp. 259, 295, 406.

[6] G. Dale, "An Account of the Principal Customs and Habits of the Natives Inhabiting the Bondei Country," *J.A.I.* (1896), xxv. 183.

[7] H. B. Rowney, *The Wild Tribes of India* (1882), p. 193.

chief article of food for all classes among the Kaffirs. One man only is allowed to touch the milk-bag.[1]

Again, remoter forms of connection can effect transmission. The natives of the Mary River and Bunya-Bunya country had a great fear of persons stepping over their bodies while lying down. "When camping out with a black boy I have unthinkingly stepped over him, and have known him involuntarily to cry out with fear and to denounce the ignorance and stupidity of white people."[2] When the son of Bábar was lying at the point of death, and the doctors could do nothing, "it was suggested that nothing could save him but some supreme sacrifice to God. Bábar eagerly caught at the hope, and resolved at once to lay down his life for his son. . . . He entered his son's chamber, and going to the head of the bed, walked gravely three times round the sick man saying the while: 'On me be all that thou art suffering! . . .' 'I have prevailed,' at last he was heard to cry: 'I have taken it!'"[3] In Tenimber it is a great insult to step over a man who is lying on the ground. As an insult it is coupled with spitting in a man's face.[4] Mere touch or proximity is quite enough. The sensitive part of a Kaffir "doctor" is his shoulders. No one may touch him there. If a man merely stands behind a "doctor," he sends him off with the cry, "Get away! you are hurting me; it is as if you sat upon me."[5] Further, in Ethiopia disease can be caused by the shadow of an enemy falling upon one.[6]

[1] J. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (1858), p. 152.
[2] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), iii. 179; cp. i. 50.
[3] S. L. Poole, *Bábar* (1899), pp. 198-199.
[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 295; cp. p. 129.
[5] H. Callaway, *op. cit.*, p. 159.
[6] Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), ii. 158.

Amongst the Hawaiians, people may not let their shadows fall upon the chief.[1]

The mere act of sight can also transmit qualities. Thus Kolosh women during menstruation and child-birth live in a special hut. They are avoided by the men, and wear at menstruation a peculiar hat, that they "may not defile heaven with a look."[2] When Kaffirs have killed the "sacred" lion, to avert "danger" they rub their eyes with his skin before they look at his dead body.[3] The natives of Borneo are afraid lest Europeans, by looking at them, should make them ill.[4] Some Papuans complained to an explorer that they began to die "as soon as you looked at us."[5] Guiana Indians, before approaching a dangerous place, rub their eyes with pepper to make them fill with water, by way of not seeing the dreaded object.[6] Similar phenomena are connected with the sense of sight throughout the world. As are all the senses, so sight is a form of contact, both in modern physics, primitive belief and still to some extent in ordinary civilised ideas. The "power of the human eye" is a case of this, and we still fear "influence" by being looked at or by seeing persons and things. We prevent a child from seeing a dead person for sentimental reasons—early man did so for the more practical purpose of avoiding contagion.[7] So we would explain the common rule

[1] C. de Varigny, *Quatorze ans aux Iles Sandwich* (1874), p. 13.

[2] G. F. Erman, *Travels in Siberia* (1848), ii. 318.

[3] T. Arbousset *and* F. Daumas, *Narrative of an Exploratory Tour to the North-East of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope* (1846), p. 214.

[4] C. A. L. M. Schwaner, *Borneo* (1853-1854), ii. 167.

[5] L. M. d'Albertis, *New Guinea* (1880), p. 53.

[6] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana* (1883), p. 369.

[7] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 361.

which forbids one to look back after performing a dangerous thing or visiting a dangerous place. An interesting feature of these beliefs appears in the above-cited cases; to the savage, the same result ensues from seeing a dangerous thing and from being seen by it. The sense of sight is both active and passive, and contact through it can be effected from either end. The myth of the ostrich, which is supposed to bury its head in the sand with the idea that it thus becomes invisible, is repeated in human thought, both when the savage shuts his eyes to avoid seeing a dreaded thing, as an equivalent to not being seen by it, and when we shut our eyes to escape from a sight we are afraid of or a thought that we would expel. The world-wide belief in the "evil eye," and the fact that psychical influence is most easily exerted by the look, illustrate these ideas. It is especially envy that is here transmitted. Lane mentions the case of an Egyptian refusing to buy meat from a well-patronised butcher's shop, because it would be poisonous to eat meat which had hung in the street before the eyes of the public, so that every beggar who passed envied it.[1]

Lastly, a man's words—heard, reported or read—can transmit his "influence," both in our sense and in the primitive material sense of the word; and here we have another curious illustration of the really scientific materialism of early man. A man's kind words transmit his kind feelings; the civilised man and the uncivilised alike recognise the result in their own consciousness when they hear such words, but in the latter case material transmission has been effected. In

[1] E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (1871), i. 326.

the same way a man's hatred is projected by a curse,[1] and a man's general character can be transmitted, as will be seen hereafter,[2] by taking his name. The name in savage thought is a real part of a man, or rather it is his "essence," the "real" sum of his characteristics. But so it is to us, if we consider the matter; the only difference is that to the savage the idea is "real" in the scholastic sense, to us it is "nominal." Modern Egyptians cure sickness by writing a passage from the Koran on the inside of an earthen bowl; water is poured in and stirred till the writing is worked off, the patient drinks the water with the sacred words thus infused.[3] The Malays write charms on paper or cloth and wear them on the person; sometimes they are written on the body itself, especially on the part to be affected; occasionally they are written on a cup, which is then used for drinking purposes.[4] These cases serve to show what is a natural extension, transmission of properties effected from objects such as fetishes and charms, which are endowed by man's ideas with virtue and power, a conception well illustrated by the people of Surinam, who wear iron, the "strong substance," in order to acquire strength,[5] or from things which have a connection with gods or sacred objects, such as holy water and consecrated substances. The Andamanese, before leaving home, get a medicine-man to give them charms to keep off harm at the hands of those they are going to visit. He applies an ointment to their bodies and weapons. Hence they bear a

[1] [Cp. A. E. Crawley, "Cursing and Blessing," *E.R.E.* (1911), iv. 367-374.]

[2] [Below, i. 292, 320 *et seq.*]

[3] E. W. Lane, *op. cit.*, i. 328.

[4] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 567.

[5] K. Martin, "Bericht über eine reise ins Gebiet des Oberen Surinam," *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* (1886), xxxv. 24.

charmed life, and their weapons are sure to kill.[1] When going to war the Tenimberese are sprinkled with holy water ; they also eat snakes in order to be brave. As charms against danger in war, they wear the *vertebrae* of a slain foe as a necklace ; they also steep this in water, then drink, and wash their bodies with it.[2]

Transmission of properties can thus be effected by any portion of the organism or by anything that, in the wide view of the savage, belongs to the personality ; but, conversely, as each and all of these are instinct with the life and character of the possessor, it follows that any result produced upon any of them, is regarded as done to the whole man. In primitive thought, the individualistic conception of personality is so sensitive, and so materialistic, that anything which has once formed part of the man, or anything that has been in but momentary contact with him, is held to retain its connection, and, when acted upon, to affect the original owner, whose substance it still preserves. From this derive two widely spread ideas, which are, like so many early thoughts, complementary to each other. The first is that of the external soul, as to which we need but refer to Sir James Frazer's account ;[3] the second is the common belief that a part of one's self may be used as a substitute for the whole, or sacrificed to preserve the rest of the personality. This idea explains a common set of beliefs concerned with the placenta, umbilical cord and the "caul." In Amboina the placenta is hidden away in a tree ;[4] similarly

[1] E. H. Man, "The Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands," *J.A.I.* (1883), xii. 175.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 298.

[3] Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), xi. 95-218.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

in the Babar Islands, where, on their way to the tree the women carry weapons, "because evil spirits might, if they got hold of the placenta, make the child ill."[1] A particular point in connection with these appurtenances of the new-born child is, that as they preserve the substance of the possessor, they give him health and strength in after-life. If a child is born with a caul, Amboinese women preserve this, and when the child is ill, dip it in water and give this water to the child to drink.[2] In Ceram the remains of the umbilical cord are kept, and hung round the child's neck to keep off sickness, or are otherwise used when the child is ill.[3] In the Watubela Islands the placenta is buried under a tree. The remains of the umbilical cord are preserved, to be used as medicine for the child.[4] In the islands Leti, Moa and Lakor the child's navel-string is kept, and used by him later as an amulet in war or when travelling.[5] The Central Australians work the navel-string into a necklace which the child wears round its neck. "This makes it grow, keeps it quiet, and averts illness."[6] The connection, already noticed, between these appurtenances and the idea of the external soul, is also seen in the following cases: the Fijians buried the umbilical cord with a cocoa-nut, the last being intended to grow up by the time the child reached maturity.[7] It is interesting to compare the modern custom of planting a tree as a record of the birth of a child. The navel-string and the placenta are in South Celebes called the "brother" and "sister" of the child.[8]

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 355. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 74.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 135. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 208. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 391.
[6] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 461.
[7] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 175.
[8] B. F. Matthes, *Bijdragen tot de Ethnologie van Zuider-Celebes* (1875), p. 57.

We have seen the transmission, chiefly involuntary, of a man's properties through contact with him or with any part of him, an object that has had connection with him, and we now come to what is a development of these ideas of contact, in cases where the individual transmits his own properties or his feelings by means of contact with himself or by putting detachable parts of himself in contact with others, by an act of will or "intention." So the lover imparts his love to his mistress by all kinds of methods—he sends her a lock of hair, or food he has touched, in the hope that his personality contained therein will soften her heart, that is, that she may be assimilated to him by contact with him.

Enemies, on the other hand, can do the same by all these methods, but it is not surprising that they seldom use them. The reason is that they would thus put themselves in the power of the very man they wish to hurt, by giving to him a part of themselves, for he may injure them by magic treatment of it, which his own *virus* contained in the part might not be strong enough to overcome. The next course is then naturally found to be either to use the mere act of will or to get hold of some detachable part of the man or anything that has been in contact with him, and by working the "intention" on that, to do him hurt. The idea is, as stated above, a man is not distinguished from his separate parts, and injury done to them is done to him. The easy analogy which leads the savage to "make-believe," assists him here. It will be convenient to give this widely spread method and theory the name it has in Australia, where its development is very complete, that of *ngadhungi*. Both the art of will, assisted sometimes by a make-believe process, and also the method of *ngadhungi* are, as will be obvious, developments of the idea of contact; and both,

it is hardly necessary to premise, are often used for benevolent purposes. The following cases show how the "intention" or subjective attitude may produce the various results connected with taboo. In order to ward off danger from themselves or to send evil to another person, the Zulus squirt water containing medicine from the mouth.[1] To cause a person to become thin and weak, the Arunta puts spittle on the tips of his fingers, which are then bunched together and jerked in the direction of the victim. This is called *Puliliwuma* or spittle-throwing.[2] A strong whip associated with magic is carried by Central Australian men. "The sight of one is alone enough to cause the greatest fright to a woman who has offended her husband, while the stroke is supposed to result in death, or at least in maiming for life. In addition to this use, the *ililika* is sometimes unwound and cracked like a whip in the direction of any individual whom it is desired to injure, when the evil influence is supposed to travel through the air, and so to reach the victim."[3] In many Amboina villages there are persons who anoint their eyes daily with certain ingredients, in order to increase their keenness of sight, and to acquire "a warm eye." Such are greatly feared, for they can by concentration of a look make anyone ill and poison food.[4] Sorcerers are very dangerous in Cambodia, in that they can enchant people by a mere act of will.[5] In Tenimber and Timorlaut a common method of causing a man to be ill

[1] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), p. 435.

[2] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 552.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 540.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 61.

[5] É. Aymonier, "Note sur les coutumes et croyances superstitieuses des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine Française* (1883), vi. 182.

is to place objects, such as thorns and sharp stones, on the ground where he is likely to pass. Over these curses have been muttered. The persons walking over these objects will fall ill. Another method is to use curses, and blow in a special way under a man's house.[1] This illustrates a principle of savage "make-believe," namely, a fear of direct action. The Australians have a well-known method of injuring persons at a distance, by pointing a bone at them.[2] Being the bone of a dead man it has in it both human qualities and the contagion of death, but apart from these accidents, the essence of the practice is this: the man first sings curses and evil wishes over it, as "may your heart be rent asunder," and his will or "intention" of hatred and malice enters materially into the bone, and veritably "informs" it. As the natives explain, "any bone, stick, spear, etc., which has been 'sung,' is endowed with *Arungquiltha*, magical poisonous properties," but these are the man's temporary characteristics of hate materially conceived.[3] There are actual cases where a man who has been hit by a "sung" spear, or who knows that a man has pointed "the bone" at him, has pined away and died of fear.[4] For a very different object, that of inspiring love, the same method is used. Women "sing" over necklets of fur, which they place round the man's neck, or "sing" over some food which they then give him to eat.[5] They transfuse, in fact, their "intention" of love into the substance, and thus it passes to the person intended.

The same conception is the essential feature of a

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

[2] "The Habits, etc., of the Aborigines in District of Powell's Creek, Northern Territory of South Australia," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 178.

[3] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *op. cit.*, pp. 534, 537.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 537.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 548.

common class of oaths and ordeals, which in primitive practice are identical.[1] The formula of the oath passes materially into the thing sworn by, which as Greek reminds us, was the original "oath," and as the following cases show, is of such a character as to do that injury to the perjurer which he invokes upon himself. The "oath" is held, or eaten or drunk, so as to ensure assimilation, and if perjury or treachery results, the wish has its effect and renders the substance of the "oath" deleterious. Thus, in Madagascar, parties taking an oath pray that the liquor drunk, which is the material "oath," may turn into poison for him who breaks it.[2] In Ceram an oath is taken by eating food in which a sword has been placed.[3] In Tenimber the oath-taker invokes death, and drinks his own blood in which a sword has been dipped.[4] The Tunguses drink the blood of a dog, which is then burned, and the wish made is "may I burn as this dog if I break my oath."[5] Amongst the Malays, when swearing fidelity, alliance, etc., water in which daggers, spears, or bullets have been dipped, is drunk, the drinker saying, "If I turn traitor, may I be eaten up by this dagger or spear."[6] The terms of a Sumatran oath are,

[1] [Cp. A. E. Crawley, "Oath (Introductory and Primitive)," *E.R.E.* (1917), ix. 430-434; *id.*, "Ordeal (Introductory and Primitive)," *E.R.E.* (1917), ix. 507-512; L. Lévy-Bruhl, *Primitive Mentality* (1923), pp. 219 *et seq.*; Sir J. G. Frazer, *Folk-lore in the Old Testament* (1918), i. 391 *et seq.*, ii. 403 *et seq.*, iii. 304 *et seq.*; E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), i. 47 *et seq.*; J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (1922), pp. 138 *et seq.*]

[2] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde* (1834-1835), i. 181.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 129.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 284.

[5] J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie* (1736), p. 48.

[6] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 528.

"If what I now declare is truly and really so, may I be freed and cleared from my oath; if what I assert is wittingly false, may my oath be the cause of my destruction."[1] The same material transmission of "intention" is the motive power behind the practice of setting up taboo-marks on property. The indignation of the injured party "informs" the notice, just as the power of the law is behind the name on a modern warning to trespassers. For the security of property in the Luang-Sermata Islands, they place marks thereon to warn people from trespassing. Any person found trespassing becomes ill or dies. These marks are of various kinds: a notice made of hen-feathers causes pain in the thief's back; one sort causes him to be struck by lightning, another to be eaten by sharks.[2] Similarly, sickness follows trespassers on property thus protected in the island Makiser.[3]

The method of *ngadhungi* is well known. On the principle stated above, a man can work injury or any result according to his "intention" on another by treating parts of him in various ways. It will be remembered that a man's food is especially connected with him, from the mere fact of the important results of food to the organism, and it will be noticed that such detachable portions of personality as food, hair, nail-parings, clothes, and the like, are peculiarly easy to get hold of. Amongst the aborigines of Queensland any food left over from the meal is always burnt, to prevent the possibility of sorcerers getting hold of it and injuring them by means of the food.[4] The western tribes of Victoria "believe

[1] W. Marsden, *The History of Sumatra* (1811), p. 238.
[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 317. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 414.
[4] C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals* (1889), p. 298.

that if an enemy gets possession of anything that has belonged to them, even such things as bones of animals which they have eaten, broken weapons, feathers, portions of dress, pieces of skin, or refuse of any kind, he can employ it as a charm to produce illness in the person to whom they belonged. They are, therefore, very careful to burn up all rubbish or uncleanness before leaving a camping-place. Should anything belonging to an unfriendly tribe be found at any time, it is given to the chief, who preserves it as a means of injuring the enemy. This *wuulon* is lent to anyone of the tribe who wishes to vent his spite against anyone belonging to the unfriendly tribe. When used as a charm, the *wuulon* is rubbed over with emu fat mixed with red clay, and tied to the point of a spear-thrower, which is stuck upright in the ground before the camp-fire. The company sit round watching it, but at such a distance that their shadows cannot fall on it. They keep chanting imprecations on the enemy till the spear-thrower turns round and falls in his direction."[1] The whole community of the Narrinyeri is influenced by disease-makers. Their method is called *ngadhungi* and is practised in the following manner: "Every adult blackfellow is constantly on the look-out for bones of ducks, swans, or other birds, or of the fish called ponde, the flesh of which has been eaten by anybody. . . . When a man has obtained a bone . . . he supposes that he possesses the power of life and death over the man, woman, or child who ate its flesh. . . . Should circumstances arise calculated to excite the resentment of the disease-maker towards the person who ate the flesh of the animal from which the bone was taken, he immediately sticks the bone in the ground near the

[1] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1881), p. 54.

fire . . . firmly believing that it will produce disease in the person for whom it was designed, however distant he may be."[1] Death also may result. All the natives, therefore, are careful to burn the bones of the animals which they eat, so as to prevent their enemies from getting hold of them. "When a person is ill he generally regards his sickness as the result of *ngadhungi*, and tries to discover who is the disease-maker. When he thinks that he has discovered him, he puts down a *ngadhungi* to the fire, for the purpose of retaliating; that is, if he has one made of an animal from which his supposed enemy has eaten. And if he has not, he tries to borrow one."[2] "Frequently, when a man has got the *ngadhungi* of another, he will go to him and say—'I have your *ngadhungi;* what will you give me for it?' Perhaps the other man will say that he has one belonging to the person who asks him the question, and in that case they will make an exchange, and each destroy the *ngadhungi*."[3] "This constant seeking for revenge produces an atmosphere of suspicion among the natives. It is often the case that they will trust none but relatives; all others are regarded as possible enemies."[4] In the Encounter Bay tribe the same superstition is rampant. If a man has not been able to get a bone of an animal eaten by his foe, he takes an animal, and cooks and offers the meat in a friendly manner to his intended victim, having previously taken from it a piece of bone.[5]

In Tanna the disease-makers injure a man by burning his *nahak*, that is, the refuse of his food, or any article

[1] G. Taplin, "The Narrinyeri," in *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (1879), p. 24.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 25. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 136.

[5] H. E. A. Meyer, "Manners and Customs of the Aborigines of the Encounter Bay Tribe," in *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (1879), p. 196.

that has been in close contact with his body. When a person is taken ill, he believes that it is occasioned by some one who is burning his *nahak ;* and if he dies, his friends ascribe it to the disease-maker as having burnt the refuse to the end. All the Tannese carry small baskets about with them, into which they put banana skins, cocoanut husk, or any refuse from that which they may have been eating, in order to avoid its discovery by an enemy, until reaching and crossing a stream of running water, which alone has the power of annulling such a contingency. "It is surprising how these men are dreaded, and how strong the belief is that they have in their hands the power of life and death." The belief "has so strong a hold in Tanna that all the continual fights and feuds are attributable to it."[1] In the New Hebrides generally, when the *mae* snake carries away a fragment of food into the place sacred to a spirit, a man who has eaten of that food will sicken as the fragment decays.[2] In the Banks Islands one man can injure another by charming some bits of food, hair or nail-parings, anything in fact that has been in close connection with his body ; they are consequently at pains to hide all such.[3] In Pululaa of the Solomon Islands, guests bring their own food to feasts, as they may not eat the food set out. The belief is that if a visitor should purposely or accidentally retain a morsel of the food of his host, he can thereby exercise a mysterious influence over the giver of the feast. In such a contingency the host will redeem the lost fragment at as high a figure as

[1] G. Turner, *Nineteen Years in Polynesia* (1861), p. 89; B. T. Somerville, "Notes on some Islands of the New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 19, 20.

[2] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (1891), p. 203.

[3] *Id.*, "Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia," *J.A.I.* (1881). x. 283.

he can afford.[1] In the same islands an enemy will throw scraps of his victim's food into a sacred pool, of which he knows the spirit or *Tindalo*. If the food is eaten by a fish or snake the man will die.[2] The practice of burning a man's food in order to injure him flourishes in New Britain ; the islanders are therefore careful to hide or burn their leavings.[3] Throughout Melanesia it is believed that one man may harm another by taking bits of his food into a sacred place, upon which the victim's lips will swell and his body break out with ulcers.[4]

The Malays take great care in disposing of the clippings of hair, as they believe that "the sympathetic connection which exists between himself and every part of his body continues to exist, even after the physical connection has been severed, and that he will suffer from any harm that may befall the severed parts of his body, such as the clippings of his hair or the parings of his nails. Accordingly he takes care that these severed portions of himself shall not be left in places where they might either be exposed to accidental injury, or fall into the hands of malicious persons who might work magic on them to his detriment or death."[5] Charms are used by the Malays for an infinity of purposes. They are worked by direct contact, sometimes by indirect, sometimes without. To charm a person, "take soil from the centre of the footprint of the person you wish to charm, and treat it ceremonially for about three days."[6] Another Malay method of charming a

[1] W. Coote, *Wanderings, South and East* (1882), p. 177.

[2] R. H. Codrington, "Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia," *J.A.I.* (1881), x. 309.

[3] W. Powell, *Wanderings in a Wild Country* (1883), p. 171.

[4] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (1891), p. 203.

[5] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), pp. 44-45.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 568.

person is to scrape off some of the wood of the floor from the place where your intended victim has been sitting; then mould it with wax into a figure resembling him; the figure is scorched over a lamp, while the following words are repeated, "It is not wax that I am scorching, it is the liver, heart, and spleen of so-and-so that I scorch."[1] The Malays use clippings of the victim's hair, his saliva, and parings of his nails, etc., in making the well-known wax image, into which pins are stuck, and "which is still believed by all Malays to be a most effective method of causing the illness or death of an enemy."[2] To work dissension between a husband and wife, a Malay makes two wax figures resembling them; he breathes upon them, and puts them back to back, so that they look away from one another.[3] In Luang-Sermata one can cause swellings of the head or hands of an enemy by burning his hair.[4] In Buru, as a love-charm, one "speaks over" oil the woman uses for her hair or over a hair of hers one finds.[5] In the Babar Islands the method is used to make people ill, of burning their hair or *sirih* they have used. This is also done by rejected lovers.[6] The Australian natives of the Mary River and Bunya-Bunya country believe that if you can procure some hair or excrement of an enemy, his life will decay while they are in your possession.[7] The Cambodians say that a traveller must not throw away fragments of his garments when in a

[1] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), pp. 569-570; cp. Theocritus, *Idylls*, ii.

[2] W. W. Skeat, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 573.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 328.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 377.

[7] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), iii. 179.

foreign country. If he does not wish to be unlucky he must keep them.[1]

The Gippsland tribes of Australia "practised sorcery, with a view to taking the lives of their enemies. The mode of proceeding was to obtain possession of something which had belonged to the person whose death was desired, such as some of his hair, excrement, or food; or to touch him with an egg-shaped piece of stone which was called *bulk*, and was thought to be possessed of magic powers. At other times they would charm by means of the *makthar* (real name of the person), or several of them retiring to some lonely spot, and drawing on the ground a rude likeness of the victim, would sit around it and devote him to destruction with cabalistic ceremonies. Such was their dread of proceedings of this sort that, not unfrequently, men and women who learnt that they had been made the subjects of incantation, quickly pined away and died of fright."[2] The Central Australians use the method of drawing a portrait of the intended victim, and stabbing it.[3] In Wetar one can make a man ill by getting hold of some saliva, hair, *betel* he has chewed, a piece of his clothes or anything belonging to him. These objects are put in a place haunted by evil spirits, who are then called upon to kill the man or make him ill.[4] Before a battle a Zulu chief sits on a circlet of "medicines," containing some object belonging to the hostile chief, and he says, "I am overcoming him, I am now treading him down,

[1] É. Aymonier, "Note sur les coutumes et croyances superstitienses des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine Française* (1883), vi. 166.

[2] E. M. Curr, *op. cit.*, iii. 547.

[3] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 550.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 451.

he is now under me. I do not know by what way he will escape."[1] The Zulus also use a vessel of medicines which one churns like a Chinese praying-machine. A young man will use it as a love-charm; if it froths, he knows he has prevailed over the girl. Something belonging to her is put in it.[2] The churn is used before war, with something in it belonging to the hostile chief, so as to kill or weaken him.[3] Any disease may be caused by walking over "medicines" placed, to that end, in the path.[4] Another account of the Zulus says that before the army sets out, the king makes "medicine" in which is some personal article belonging to his enemy. "The belief in this is so strong, that when a chief is forced to retreat, the floor of his hut is scraped, and for this reason Dingan, when he fled from the Boers, burnt his hut."[5]

A very common form is the injuring of a person by means of his name. To injure a person, the Amboinese use some of his *sirih* he has thrown away, a piece of his hair, or clothing; also one writes his name on a piece of paper, which is put in a gun and fired off, or else one puts it in the highest branches of a tree.[6] The Gippsland blacks, objected strongly to let any one outside the tribe know their names, lest their enemies, learning them, should make them vehicles of incantation, and so charm their lives away. As children were not thought to have enemies, they used to speak of a man as "the father, uncle, or cousin of so-and-so," naming a child, but on all occasions abstained from mentioning

[1] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), p. 342.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 343. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 346. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[5] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), p. 343.
[6] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), pp. 61, 79.

the name of a grown-up person.[1] In many Australian tribes "the belief obtains that the life of an enemy may be taken by the use of his name in incantations. The consequence of this idea is, that in the tribes in which it obtains, the name of the male is given up for ever at the time when he undergoes the first of a series of ceremonies which end in conferring the rights of manhood. In such tribes a man has no name, and, instead of calling a man by name, one addresses him as brother, nephew, or cousin, as the case may be, or by the name of the class to which he belongs."[2] In modern Europe there is still to be found, especially amongst children, some diffidence about revealing the Christian name.[3]

[1] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), iii. 545.

[2] *Ibid.*, i. 46. [Cp. above, i. 77 *et seq.*]

[3] [See, for instance, *L'intermédiaire des chercheurs et curieux* (1925), lxxviii. 958; (1926), lxxix. 79-80.]

CHAPTER VI

HUMAN RELATIONS (*Concluded*)

With this sensibility to contact there is always closely connected the instinctive care of functions and organs, which are, of course, but specialised channels of contact, both in use and in origin, and this care is common to all highly organised life. It is a good instance of physiological thought. Throughout the world it is the general rule for the performance of human functions to take place in secret, and this secrecy is closer in primitive than in civilised custom.[1] As will be shown later,[2] one important function, that of eating and drinking, though no longer secret in civilised periods, was so in early society. Prayer before such functions testifies to this caution, and the custom of the Babar islanders, who pray to the ancestral spirits before eating, drinking, and sleeping,[3] or of the people of Timorlaut, who pray to *Dudilaa* before such functions as sexual intercourse, eating and drinking,[4] is typical of the generality of mankind. Hence also the general ascription of the taboo character to the various functions, especially the nutritive and sexual. When called "unclean," the term originally is equivalent to taboo, still undifferentiated, though later it becomes specialised by other associations. The Hindu and Muslim rules of "uncleanness"

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), pp. 96, 406.

[2] [Below, i. 190 *et seq.*]

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 338.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 281.

in connection with physical functions, are examples of a general human practice.[1] The universal desire for solitude during the performance of certain physical functions, shared by man with the higher animals, is an extension of the organic instinct for safety and self-preservation. These functions, especially the nutritive, sexual and excretory, are not only of supreme importance in organic life, but their performance exposes the individual to danger by rendering him defenceless for the time being. Ideas formed straight from this instinct invest such functions at once with a potential sacredness and assist towards a religious concealment of them.[2] Again, this impulse for solitude is emphasised, as psychology proves, in illness and in critical states, a fact which shows the origin of many taboos on their subjective side.

In the development of these ideas, each principle of contact has its share, and the biological caution is intensified by religious conceptions. The very complexity and importance of functions intensifies both the biological and the religious care of them. The individual avoids, in the first place, the dangers resulting to himself from contact with others ; and secondly, from knowledge of these dangers, he concludes that the material secretions and emanations are in every case dangerous, even apart from personal properties, and accordingly avoids his own, for his own sake and, altruistically, for the sake of his fellows. This altruistic feeling is later, and is connected with disgust.

While it is the functions and external organs connected with nutrition and sex that are most guarded,

[1] H. Vámbéry, *Sketches of Central Asia* (1868), p. 190.

[2] [Cp. H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1910), i. 40.]

and the senses of taste and touch that are here most sensitive, yet the instinct to preserve and insulate from danger all the channels of sense is seen in savage custom. This insulation is effected sometimes by wearing amulets upon the external organs, sometimes by means of the painful processes of tattooing, boring and scarification. It is erroneous to attribute these practices to the desire for ornament. There is ample evidence that "savage mutilation" is never due to this desire; the savage does not hold with the maxim—*il faut souffrir pour être belle*; on the contrary, he is extremely averse to pain, except for the purpose of preserving his life, health and strength. Accordingly, when we find that the mouth and lips, the teeth, nose, eyes, ears and genital organs are subjected to such processes, we may infer that the object is to secure the safety of these sense organs, by what is practically a permanent amulet or charm.[1]

The idea behind the mutilation of organs is complex. Let us take the common practices of piercing an organ, filing the teeth, knocking out a tooth, circumcision and perforation of the hymen. The first part of the idea is to obviate possible difficulty in function, suggested by an apparent closure of the organ; this possibility of difficulty is to the savage a potentiality of evil, and is connected with the fear of doing a thing for the first time, a fear which, as we have seen,[2] creates a material dangerous substance attaching to the thing in question, and needing removal before contact can safely take place. Shortly after a birth the Malays administer to the child

[1] [Dr Ellis has suggested, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1910), i. 22, that the form of mutilation called infibulation is due to a modest feeling that the glans should be concealed; but there seems to be no evidence for this theory, see E. J. Dingwall, *Male Infibulation* (1925).]

[2] [Above, i. 29-30.]

"the mouth-opener," "first you take a green cocoa-nut, split it in halves, put a grain of salt inside one half of the shell, and give it to the child to drink, counting up to seven, and putting it up to the child's mouth at the word seven." [1] This account is important as suggesting that the first taking of food, the first employment of the mouth, is a dangerous crisis. When we take into account the importance of food in savage life, and the care of the mouth and teeth resulting, also the fact that this knocking out of teeth, like the similar process of teeth-filing, is regularly performed at puberty, when as a rule there are certain food taboos removed, and a boy is initiated to "man's food," it is a fair conjecture that its object is to secure in some way the safety of that important function. Dr Skeat was invariably told that the Malay practice of teeth-filing not only beautified but preserved the teeth from decay.[2] The idea of ornament is later. When a Dieri boy has had the teeth knocked out, he may not look at the men who performed the operation, or "his mouth would close up and he would be unable to eat." [3]

With the particular imaginary danger already mentioned all danger of material contact of course combines, including that of disease in the wide range of reality and imagination with which early man regards disease. Amongst the Cadiacks a hole is bored through the *septum* of the child's nose, when it is washed after birth. These people have also the practice of piercing the *septum* in cases when venereal disease attacks the nose.[4]

[1] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 337.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 359.

[3] A. W. Howitt, "The Dieri and other kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *J.A.I.* (1891), xx. 80.

[4] U. Lisiansky, *A Voyage Round the World* (1814), pp. 200-201.

The connection is obvious. The Yorubas call circumcision "the cutting that saves."[1] Amongst the Central Australians there is a causal connection between the practice of sub-incision and the common disease *Erkincha*. It is not, as has been proved, intended to prevent impregnation, nor does it have this result.[2] The ceremony of head-biting performed on Central Australian boys at puberty, is supposed to make the hair grow strong.[3] Now, it is prevention of future harm, illness and weakness, and transmission of strength and life that are one special object of ceremonies at puberty. Again, it has been conclusively proved that circumcision does not prevent disease, and it is probable that there was no sanitary intention in its origin, except such as forms part of the explanation here given.[4] The ceremony amongst the Semites was originally "religious" in the primitive sense, but here, as elsewhere, when the religious habit became rational, the fallacy of sanitary intention in circumcision became prominent, and may often have been the reason for the continuance of the practice. The last factor in the principle behind these mutilations is one very closely connected with ideas of contact, and applies especially to such practices as circumcision. The deleterious emanation from strange or new things is identical in theory with human emanations, not only from strange or handselled beings, but from characteristic parts of such, and in later thought, from such parts of one's own personality. This dangerous emanation is any

[1] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), p. 66.

[2] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 264, 405.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 251.

[4] J. Jacobs, "The Racial Characteristics of Modern Jews," *J.A.I.* (1886), xv. 32.

physical secretion religiously regarded, and its retention is prevented by cutting away separable parts which would easily harbour it, as the teeth retain morsels of food. This primitive notion is the same with those of personal cleanliness and of the removal of separable parts of a tabooed person. Sir James Frazer points out the idea of destroying separable parts of tabooed persons; thus, in Rotti the first hair of a child is not his own, and unless cut off will make him ill.[1] When the part is cut off, there result the ideas, first of securing the safety of the rest by sacrificing a part, a practice well illustrated by the custom of cutting off a little finger; and secondly, of sacrificing such part to a deity so as to compensate the rest by making it less "impure" or taboo. Thus, Sir A. B. Ellis infers that circumcision amongst the Yoruba and Ewe peoples is a sacrifice of a portion of the organ, which the god inspires, to ensure the well-being of the rest. The rite is there connected with the worship of *Elegbra*.[2] And for the earlier notion, the Jews and Egyptians regarded circumcision as a "cleansing."[3]

Circumcision and artificial hymen perforation thus originated in the intention both to obviate hylo-idealistic danger resulting from apparent closure, and to remove a separable part of a taboo organ, on the above-stated principles.[4] This removal also explains the

[1] [Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), iii. 276, 283-284.]

[2] Sir A. B. Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

[3] J. P. Trusen, *Die Sitten, Gebraüche und Krankheiten der alten Hebräer* (1853), p. 115.

[4] [M. van Gennep writes, *Les Rites de Passage* (1909), p. 103 *n.*[3]: "[la théorie] de Crawley (*The Mystic Rose*, p. 396, 397 [*sic* for p. 138]) que la circoncision et la perforation de l'hymen ont pour but 'de remédier au danger hylo-idéalistique qui résulte d'une clôture apparente' est presque de la fantaisie"; but it will be observed that M. van Gennep, after giving an incorrect reference, almost burlesques the above passage.]

practice of excision. The other ideas follow later, and the safety both of the individual and of those who will have contact with him or her is the more necessary because the contact is with the other, the dangerous sex. As to the insertion of plugs and sticks and the like, in the nose, lips and ears, it is probable that the original object was to keep off evil from the organs by a mark, an idea connected with the widely spread belief that the attention of the evil influence is thus diverted from the organ as lightning is diverted from an object by the lightning-rod.[1]

Here is to be considered the psychology of disgust. The emotion in its origin is caused by the presence or contact of what is dangerous or useless to the individual organism, chiefly in connection with the nutritive and sexual functions. It is part of the natural law of economy, ultimately chemical, which produces an impulse for what one needs and an avoidance of what one does not need, or has cast away. Food that is needed is the object of man's fiercest desire, and, on the other hand, food after satiety or the excreta from food produce the strongest loathing ; in each case the feeling is part of the primary nutritive impulse. The same desire and loathing belong to the sexual functions and emotions, the development and complement of the nutritive. The sensitive instinct of self-preservation and of self-realisation which insulates a man from other organisms, accentuates the emotion of disgust when the cast-off substances are from others, and makes those from himself more tolerable. Further, where there is no desire, there is potential disgust, especially at the sight of

[1] [Cp. E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1921), i. 504-505.]

another's function. Disgust correlates with satiety and is the opposite pole to desire and satisfaction, and ultimately its connection is with the alimentary functions alone, from which the sexual and other are developed. Desire and disgust are the final expression of chemical laws of combination and rejection. Desire and disgust are curiously blended when with one's own desire unsatisfied one sees the satisfaction of another; and here we may see the altruistic stage beginning; this has two sides, the fear of causing desire in others, and the fear of causing disgust, in each case personal isolation being the psychological result. [To which Dr Ellis adds, "The special secrecy sometimes observed by women is probably due to the fact that women would be less able to resist the emotions that the act of eating would arouse in others."[1] On the modesty of women Dr Ellis also made the valuable observation in this connection, when he was on midwife duty in the London slums, that this modesty was due to the fear of being disgusting; when the women "realized that I found nothing disgusting in whatever was proper and necessary to be done under the circumstances, it almost invariably happened that every sign of modesty at once disappeared."][2]

The ideas of impurity and ceremonial "uncleanness" are closely connected with these phenomena, and in primitive thought are concerned with the nutritive no less than with other functions. Theoretically, if we carry primitive ideas to their logical conclusion, the perfectly "pure" person is one who should not only avoid contact with the functional effluvia of others, but all

[1] H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1910), i. 49.
[2] *Ibid.*, i. 49.

contact with persons also; and moreover, to obviate pollution from his own functions, who should abstain not only from sexual but from nutritive processes as well. It is the ascetic ideal of the perfect Buddhist. This practice (ἄσκησις) has probably assisted man considerably towards attaining a higher than animal culture.

Again, the feeling of shame is closely connected with these functional phenomena; it is produced by ideas which arise from the importance and sensibility of functions, tending towards diffidence and mistrust of them, and is expressed originally upon any external interference with a function. Later it became altruistic. We may also observe that amongst early men it is also to an important extent concerned with alimentary processes. It is at first sight surprising to read the following statement, but a slight acquaintance with primitive habit shows how inevitable such facts are, and observations of the lower classes in modern times reveals the same phenomenon. Amongst the Bakairi every man eats by himself; when one eats in the presence of another, it is the custom to do so with head averted, while the other turns his back and does not speak till the meal is over. When the German explorer, not knowing of this, ate his lunch without giving notice, they hung their heads and showed on their faces real shame.[1]

All these emotions and the ideas connected therewith are part of the foundation of social and sexual taboo. Closely connected as they are with contact and with functional sensitiveness, they at once, when in the altruistic stage in which one conceals or refrains from functions to avoid causing others to feel disgust or shame, vary in intensity according to the distance of the person whose feel-

[1] K. von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens* (1894), p. 66.

ings are being considered. A man would certainly avoid performing such acts as involve these emotions before an entire stranger, for to primitive thought a stranger is a potential foe, and in such a case we see the original cause of such secrecy; but on the other hand, amongst acquaintances and friends, he is less ready to insist upon secrecy than he is with closer connections, such as those with whom he lives. The reason is the accentuation, first of the danger, and later of altruistic consideration, produced in each case by the very closeness of the contact. Add to this the religious caution between the two sexes, and we get a potential avoidance of all such functions in the presence of the other sex generally, and especially in the presence of those with whom a man is in closest daily contact. Not only civilised ideas and habits of decency and personal cleanliness, but human systems and institutions of the most important character are built on these foundations.

These ideas of contact, which are found all over the world, give to human relations generally a religious meaning, such as we can hardly realise by imagination. Every individual, as such, is surrounded by a taboo of personal isolation; and for communication between him and his fellows there is in theory needed a go-between. A type of this may be seen in the New Hebridean custom, where the last man to "take the book" (that is, turn Christian), was a "sacred man," whose sanctity was such that anything given to him by a white man had to be passed through the hands of a go-between.[1] Secondly, to take the dangerous side of the taboo characer, all human and sexual properties, states of mind and of

[1] B. T. Somerville, "Notes on some Islands of the New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 12.

emotion, even acts and thoughts, are so material that they exude, *sans phrase*, from the skin. In civilised stages of society, moral and social systems which are themselves closely connected in origin with this early view of contact, have so defined and safeguarded human relations that these ideas have almost disappeared. They exist still, however, in one or two special forms, as in the still rampant belief in the evil eye throughout Southern Europe, and in the refinement always kept in civilisation, which reveals its material origin in more or less dainty avoidance of the lower classes and of "publicans and sinners."

Primitive man has some differences in his code of morals, but on the whole he is more moral in the social sense than is civilised man. A few examples will illustrate the basis of primitive morality. The immaturity of the human "will" is a characteristic of early man. The following passage applies still more to earlier peoples: "We have to bear in mind the absolute helplessness of the Fijian, in fact, the Polynesian generally, when anybody has acquired a moral ascendancy over him."[1] Death often occurs from this moral fear. As we have seen, amongst the Australians a great motor power is the belief in the sorcery or witchcraft. In the everyday life of the black, a pressure originating in this source may be said to be always at work.[2] Of the Kurnai it is said that "the gratification of self is choked in them, as in us, by a sense of duty or by affection. Speaking to a Kroatun young man about the food prohibited during initiation, I said, 'But if you were hungry and caught a

[1] B. Seemann, *Viti* (1862), p. 190.

[2] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), i. 45-46.

female opossum, you might eat it if the old men were not there'; he replied, 'I could not do that: it would not be right.' Although I tried to find out from him some other reason, he could give no other than that it would be wrong to disregard the customs."[1] In New South Wales the universal reprobation which followed a breach of ancient customs, preserved a strict observance of morality.[2] Amongst the Maoris taboo was law and far more observed and feared than the latter, as such, ever has been in higher culture.[3] So it has been said of the Fijian taboo that it "is a religion in itself, and without doubt has helped to prevent savages from allowing their naturally depraved natures to have full scope to carry out their intentions. The law-givers who introduced the *tambu* must have done so with the idea of promoting the happiness of the community, and of encouraging morality among the people."[4] The Leh-tas, according to the Karens, have no laws or rulers, and do not require any, as they never commit any evil among themselves or against other people. "The sense of shame amongst this tribe is so acute, that on being accused of any evil act by several of the community, the person so accused retires to a desolate spot, digs his grave and strangles himself."[5] Amongst the Hill Dyaks crime is so rare that its punishments are only known from tradition. They have a complete system of taboo similar to the Polynesian.[6] In New Britain marriage within the totem-clan would bring instant destruction upon the woman

[1] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), pp. 256-257.

[2] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-42* (1845), ii. 193.

[3] *Ibid.*, ii. 383.

[4] J. W. Anderson, *Notes of Travel in Fiji and New Caledonia* (1880), p. 89.

[5] A. R. Colquhoun, *Amongst the Shans* (1885), p. 76.

[6] H. Low, *Sarawak* (1848), pp. 247-248.

and the man's life would never be secure. Her relatives would be so ashamed that only her death could satisfy them. "However, such a case never occurs in a thickly populated district. If a man should be accused of adultery or fornication with a woman, he would at once be acquitted by the public voice, if he could say 'she is one of us;' *i.e.* she belongs to my totem."[1] In Timor "the custom of *pomali* is general, fruit-trees, houses, crops, and property of all kinds being protected from depredation by this ceremony, the reverence for which is very great. A palm branch stuck across an open door, showing that the house is tabooed, is a more effectual guard against robbery than any amount of locks and bars."[2] The same is true of most primitive races. In Hawaii a "wicked person" was one who broke taboo.[3] Amongst the Indians of Guiana any breach of the marriage system is "wicked."[4] Amongst the Zulus *umtakati* means "witch, wizard, or evil-doer," that is, murderers, adulterers, one who violates rules of consanguinity, and one who does secret injury to another by using "medicine," that is, human remains or poison. Evil-doers can injure health, destroy life, cause cows to become dry, prevent rain, occasion lightning.[5]

Turning to the question of deterrents, amongst the Bangerang it was believed that the sorcery of other tribes could be counteracted by their own incantations. On the other hand, they sometimes feel that the incantations of their own doctors can be neutralised by stronger ones on

[1] B. Danks, "Marriage Customs of the New Britain Group," *J.A.I.* (1889), xviii. 282-283.

[2] A. R. Wallace, *The Malay Archipelago* (1869), i. 450.

[3] W. Ellis, *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii* (1826), p. 279.

[4] W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana* (1868), p. 98.

[5] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), p. 114.

the part of their enemies; and so they "frequently revenge a death in the tribe—which is of course attributed to sorcery, though in effect the result of sickness or accident—by attacking at night a hostile camp and massacring the sleepers."[1] In Hawaii violators of taboo were seized by the priests and killed.[2] Curr says of the Australian tribes with which he was acquainted, "we find our blacks, male and female, submitting for years loyally and without exception to a number of irksome restraints, especially in connection with food, just as we Roman Catholics do to the fasts and abstinences imposed by the Church. Now the question is, what is the hidden power which secures the black's scrupulous compliance with custom in such cases? What is it, for instance, which prompts the hungry black boy, when out hunting with the white man, to refuse (as I have often seen him do) to share in a meal of emu flesh, or in some other sort of food forbidden to those of his age, when he might easily do so without fear of detection by his tribe? What is it that makes him so faithfully observant of many trying customs? The reply is, that the constraining power in such cases is not government, whether by chief or council, but *education*; that the black is educated from infancy in the belief that departure from the customs of his tribe is inevitably followed by one at least of many evils, such as becoming grey, ophthalmia, skin eruptions, or sickness; but above all, that it exposes the offender to the danger of death from sorcery."[3] The Luang Sermata islanders hold that sickness is due to "sin";[4] and this is a common human idea, a phase of which is the belief that evil physical results follow breaches of the

[1] E. M. Curr, *op. cit.*, i. 47, 49. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 54-55. [3] *Ibid.*

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 325.

system or principle of marriage, and, we may add, of sexual taboo generally. Amongst the Australians old people are mostly sorcerers; "and custom holds the weak and the young in willing subjection to the old."[1] In speaking of the power of the old men and the enforcing of moral laws by them, Messrs Spencer and Gillen show that the influence which supports custom is far from being impersonal. In the Central Australian tribes which they examined, they found that offenders were regularly dealt with by the elder men, and that offending natives were perfectly well aware that they would "be dealt with by something much more real than an impersonal power."[2] In reference to the dying out of native races upon contact with Europeans, they remark of the Central Australian tribes, that "the young men under the new influence become freed from the wholesome restraint of the older men, who are all-powerful in the normal condition of the tribe. The strict moral code, which is certainly enforced in their natural state, is set on one side, and nothing is adopted in place of it."[3]

Early men have also an elaborate etiquette based on these ideas. Amongst the Northern Indians when two people met, they would stop when within twenty yards, and generally sit or lie down, without speaking for some minutes.[4] The origin of this may be seen in the Australian practice; when a tribe approaches another that is unknown to it, they carry burning sticks to purify

[1] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 384.

[2] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 15.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[4] S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean* (1796), p. 332.

the air.[1] In the Dieri and neighbouring tribes, when a man reaches home no notice is taken until he sits down ; then "the friends or relations sit around, and the news is whispered, whatever it may be, and repeated in a loud voice to the whole camp."[2] Also, when an influential native arrives, he is received thus : "On approaching the camp, the inmates close in with raised arms, as in defence ; then the person of note rushes at them, making a faint blow as if to strike them, they warding it off with their shields ; immediately after they embrace him and lead him into the camp, where the women bring him food."[3] The Malay, says Wallace, is "particularly sensitive to breaches of etiquette, or any interference with the personal liberty of himself or another. As an example, I may mention that I often found it very difficult to get one Malay servant to waken another. He will call as loud as he can, but will hardly touch, much less shake his companion."[4] In the islands of Leti, Moa, and Lakor, and in the Babar Islands, no one may without important reason wake a sleeping man.[5] The same results of the taboo of personal isolation are constant in all stages of culture. The whole series of phenomena, lastly, helps to disprove the common idea that early society possessed a communistic and socialistic character. The "rights" of the individual in property, marriage and everything else, were never more clearly defined than by primitive man.

[1] R. B. Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria* (1878), i. 134.

[2] S. Gason, "The Tribes, Dieyerie, Auminie, Yandrawontha, Yarawuarka, Pilladopa," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 173.

[3] *Id.*, "From Mount Freeling to Pirigundi Lake," *in* E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), ii. 50.

[4] A. R. Wallace, *The Malay Archipelago* (1869), p. 443.

[5] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 378.

CHAPTER VII

COMMENSAL RELATIONS

THERE are still to be described the two most important forms of contact, contact by means of food and by sexual intercourse. We have deferred their description because they have so close a connection with sexual taboo, the further developments of which chiefly take the lines marked out by ideas concerning these two functions of eating and of sexual congress. Biologically, the sexual impulse is a development from the nutritive, and the primary close connection of the two functions is continued in thought, subconscious and physiological, and appears sometimes above the threshold of consciousness. We find further that many primary human conceptions are not only based on the connection but express it clearly. One of the most obvious links between the two is the kiss, and much popular thought and language preserves similar conceptions.

Various rules attest the importance of "man's bread and oil and wine," and we may begin by considering some miscellaneous examples of these.[1] The natives of the Baram district of Borneo feed alone; "they are very particular about being called away from their meals, and it takes a great deal to make a man set about doing anything before he has concluded his repast." To such an

[1] [Cp. A. E. Crawley, "Drinks, Drinking," *E.R.E.* (1912), v. 72-82; *id.*, "Food," *E.R.E.* (1913), vi. 59-63; E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), ii. 290 *et seq.*]

extent is this practice observed that it is considered wrong to attack even an enemy whilst he is eating, but the moment he has finished it is legitimate and proper to fall upon him.[1] The custom of eating in silence is found amongst the Ahts,[2] Maoris,[3] Siamese[4] and Hindus.[5] In Siam it is a maxim of the Buddhist priests that "to eat and talk at the same time is a sin."[6] The Tahitians offered a prayer before they ate their food.[7] The Mois of Cochin China invoke a superior power before eating and drinking.[8] The Malayalam Sudras of Travancore bathe and put sacred ashes on the forehead before each meal.[9] In origin the custom of prayer before eating was not an expression of thankfulness. The object was to avert any deleterious influence that the food might possess. On this is superimposed the wish that the food may be good and beneficial, may be "blessed," which passes into an invocation to a superior power to so bless it, and also, for the older idea often remains, to cleanse the food from harmful properties.

The savage realises better than most civilised men that his life, his health and strength and general well-being, depend chiefly upon what is ultimately the most necessary of human functions. It is not surprising, therefore, that so many customs and beliefs attach to the processes of eating and drinking. "The procuring of

[1] C. Hose, "The Natives of Borneo," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 160.

[2] G. M. Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life* (1868), p. 61.

[3] A. S. Thomson, *The Story of New Zealand* (1859), i. 160.

[4] Sir J. Bowring, *The Kingdom and People of Siam* (1857), i. 110.

[5] *The Laws of Manu*, iii. 236-237.

[6] Sir J. Bowring, *op. cit.*, i. 328.

[7] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), i. 350.

[8] L. Nouet, "Excursion chez les Moïs de la frontière nord-est," *Cochinchine française* (1884), viii. 12.

[9] S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore* (1883), p. 112.

food is the great business of the Australian's life," says a good observer, "and forms one of the principal topics of his conversation." [1] Custom and belief in this connection are based upon the egoistic physical sensibility of man, applied to the object of his fiercest desires, and with this there combine later all his conceptions of matter and of material and human contact.

Thus the savage is extremely careful that what he eats and drinks shall be free from deleterious properties, inherent or acquired. Such properties are all those which, as we have seen,[2] the savage attributes to material substances, and especially to dangerous persons, and are both material and spiritual, and can be imparted by all possible forms of material transmission. In this wide generalisation there would of course occur from time to time cases in which food possessed some harmful property, whether of poison or disease, and such cases corroborated the general precautions. The people of Kumaun use a special room for eating, into which nothing "unclean" may come. The cook has to put on clean clothes before cooking, and he is not allowed to touch anyone after he has begun, nor to leave the room. No one is allowed to touch him while he is at work.[3] Maoris do not eat inside the house.[4] Devout Russians have been observed to blow on the glass in order to neutralise "the Satanic operations of spirituous liquors." [5] Amongst the Eskimo, when a new spring of water is found, it is usual for the oldest man present, failing an *angekok*, to drink first, in

[1] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), i. 81.

[2] [Above, i. 124 *et seq.*]

[3] H. Rivett-Carnac, in *Panjab Notes and Queries* (1884-1885), ii. 74-75, note 454.

[4] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde* (1834-1835), ii. 411.

[5] G. E. Erman, *Travels in Siberia* (1848), i. 416.

order to rid the water of any evil influence it may possess.[1] In Eastern Central Africa, when a chief has a beer-drinking, his priest or captain brings out the beer to the guests and tastes it to show that it is not poisoned.[2] So amongst the Damaras the chief must first taste the provisions before they are eaten by the rest of the assembly.[3] Amongst the Iddahs the same custom is found,[4] and amongst the Zulus it is not etiquette to offer beer without first tasting it; "it is meant to ensure the receiver against death in the pot." While another is eating it is wrong to spit.[5] Amongst the Krumen at a palm wine-drinking, the goodwife of the house has to take the first and last draught herself, to show the guests that she has not been dealing in poison or witchcraft. This is called "taking off the fetish."[6] Amongst the Basutos, when food or drink is offered to a man and he is not sure that it is not poisoned, he lets the host taste it first.[7] These customs are widely spread in Africa. In the Banks Islands on presenting food to a visitor the host first takes a bite himself to show that it is not charmed, or to take the risk upon himself.[8] In New Guinea it is a mark of friendship to offer water to a stranger. Before presenting it, the natives first drink themselves to prove that the water is not poisoned.[9]

[1] D. Cranz, *The History of Greenland* (1820), i. 193.

[2] D. Macdonald, *Africana* (1882), i. 191.

[3] C. J. Anderson, *Lake Ngami* (1856), p. 224.

[4] J. F. Schön *and* S. Crowther, *Journals of . . . J. F. Schön and Mr S. Crowther, who accompanied the expedition up the Niger* (1842), p. 82.

[5] D. Leslie, *Among the Zulus and Amatongas* (1875), p. 205.

[6] J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa* (1856), p. 124.

[7] K. Endemann, "Mittheilungen über die Sotho-Neger," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1874), vi. 34.

[8] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (1891), p. 204.

[9] C. B. H. von Rosenberg, *Der Malayische Archipel* (1878), p. 470.

The history of fasting forms a curious chapter in the development of the human soul. In origin it was a method used by primitive man to avoid the possibility of any injurious influence entering the body. The savage never fasts because he likes it, but simply to avoid danger. This painful process is not gone through unless for some very important reason ; for instance, when a crises is at hand, when the food-supply is to be coaxed by magic, or the success of a hunt or a war to be secured, or a dangerous period of life to be passed through, such as puberty and mourning. In some of these cases the mere practice develops the further idea that fasting is useful as a training of the body and a discipline for the nerves. It is worth noting that the practice of fasting was referred to a primitive reason by the early Christians, namely, to prevent "evil spirits" entering the body.[1]

The subject of taboos upon certain foods is a large one. The practice of forbidding certain kinds of food during a dangerous state is very widely spread ; it includes cases of real dietetic science, embedded in fallacious instances based on analogy. Sometimes the choice is arbitrary, as it often is in an interesting extension of the custom, according to which an individual is throughout life, or for some particular period, forbidden a certain food.[2] Thus, amongst the Bakalai, to every man some particular food is *roondah ;* if he were to eat it his wives would give birth to children resembling it.[3] Every man and woman in the Andaman Islands is prohibited all through life from eating some one or more fish or animal. It is generally one which in childhood was observed or

[1] J. L. von Mosheim, *An Ecclesiastical History* (1765), i. 116, 262.

[2] [Cp. H. Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies* (1908), p. 65 *n.*]

[3] P. B. Du Chaillu, *Exploration and Adventures in Equatorial Africa* (1861), p. 308 ; W. Bosman, *A New Description of the Coast of Guinea* (1705), p. 400.

imagined by the mother to occasion some functional derangement. When the child is old enough, the reason is explained, and, cause and effect being clearly demonstrated, the individual avoids it carefully.[1] The principle behind this custom is that of savage make-believe. If a particular food is taboo to a man, he believes that thereby his ordinary food will never hurt him. The practice correlates in principle with the arbitrary selection of fetishes and the like, and is connected with the beliefs and customs concerning external souls. The following cases are instructive in this connection: in Halmahera and Wetar sickness is often ascribed to eating forbidden foods.[2] Icthyosis and leprosy are the consequences particularly mentioned in the former place as due to this eating of forbidden foods, which may also cause one to become a *suwanggi*. These *suwanggis* have the power of sorcery, and were often killed by the community for causing death.[3] [Boys of the Omeo tribe of Victoria believe so strongly that they would be struck by lightning if they ate forbidden food, that they would rather starve than do so.][4] Malay like modern European medicine is chiefly concerned with dieting.[5]

Further, the principles of primitive thought concerned

[1] E. H. Man, "The Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands," *J.A.I.* (1883), xii. 354.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 83; *id.*, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 452.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 452, 66.

[4] R. Helms, "Anthropological Notes," *The Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales . . . for the Year 1895* (1896), n.s. x. 393. Cp. A. W. Howitt, "Some Australian Beliefs," *J.A.I.* (1884), xiii. 192; Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 256; *idd.*, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (1904), p 613.

[5] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 408.

with contact and material transmission find full development here, in all the forms of custom and belief relating to human relations and social taboo. Material contact leaves its impress for good or bad upon food as upon everything else. Food that a man has touched is permeated by his properties, and accordingly can transmit these to others ; it is also on the same principle a part of himself, and any injury done to it is believed to affect himself. The belief extends to any food, not that he has touched, but of the same kind as he usually eats. The connection of food with human attributes is well seen in the example of the natives of the Mary River and Bunya-Bunya country, who have many idioms attributing the passions to the state of the stomach.[1] This is true of many languages and in all ages men have more or less realised the fact, but early man realises this connection most keenly. It is natural that the nearer man is to his animal ancestors, the more his life should be guided by the chief process of animal life.

Food possesses the characteristics of that from which it is taken, and the savage avoids foods that are thus harmful, and prefers those that are thus beneficial. The Maori eat beef to make them strong, and a man will eat bullock's flesh for a whole day to get up courage for a battle.[2] We have seen[3] how this obvious principle is extended to the eating of human flesh in order to acquire human strength and courage.

The method of injuring a man by magic use of remnants of his food is an extension of ideas of contact already described.[4] In Tanna, as we saw, the disease-makers injure a man by burning his *nahak*, that is, the

[1] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), iii. 191.

[2] J. Thomson, *Through Masai Land* (1887), p. 264.

[3] [Above, i. 134.]

[4] [Above, i. 157-161.]

refuse of his food, or any article that has been in close contact with his body. When a person is taken ill, he believes that it is occasioned by some one who is burning his *nahak*; and if he dies, his friends ascribe it to the disease-maker as having burnt the refuse to the end.

In the next phase, that of involuntary transmission, the specific contagion of human influences is the object of precaution. Uncivilised man regards strangers with feelings of hostility and suspicion.[2] These feelings extend to food that they have touched or tasted. Thus the Papuans of Humboldt Bay would not touch any food which their European visitors had previously tasted, nor even drink the water offered to them. This aversion was "due to superstitious ideas."[3] The Yule islanders refused to accept a share of anything which their visitors ate.[4] The black-fellows of Victoria regard as wholesome any food that is not poisonous or connected with superstitious beliefs, but they will not touch any food which has been partaken of by a stranger.[5] The Basutos were afraid to touch anything which a white man had touched.[6] The Poggy islanders would not touch the food offered them by Europeans until it had first been tasted by one of the ship's company.[7] This instance is a link with

[1] G. Turner, *Nineteen Years in Polynesia* (1861), p. 89; B. T. Somerville "Notes on Some Islands of the New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 19-20. [Cp. E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1921), i. 431.]

[2] [See above, i. 26, 131.]

[3] C. B. H. von Rosenberg, *Der Malayische Archipel* (1878), p. 478.

[4] L. M. d'Albertis, *New Guinea* (1880), i. 261.

[5] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1881), p. 18.

[6] T. Arbousset *and* F. Daumas, *Narrative of an Exploratory Tour to the North-East of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope* (1846), p. 149.

[7] J. Crisp, "An Account of the Inhabitants of the Poggy or Nassau Islands," *Asiatick Researches* (1799), vi. 81.

the last set of customs. Hence the Atiu islanders, for instance, refused to eat with the missionaries.[1]

We have now arrived at the prohibition against eating with certain persons, and the associated predilection for eating alone, as he prefers to be alone for the performance of other functions, from egoistic caution and fear of interruption. [We may begin with general rules and customs in this connection, pass on to special regulations in which the person with whom commensal relations are forbidden, is specified, and of these bring together finally such as are connected with sexual taboo.

First, then, we have a few examples of the neurasthenic obsession, as we would now call it,[2] for eating alone.] The Karayas always eat by themselves, with back turned.[3] Similarly amongst the Bakairi, who were "ashamed" when a European ate in their presence.[4] The Fijians consider it objectionable, just as we do, for several persons to drink out of the same vessel.[5] In some parts of Polynesia a man will never eat with another out of the same basket.[6] The Zafimanelos of Madagascar eat alone with locked doors.[7] [The Warua of Central Africa put a cloth before their faces when drinking, and would not allow anyone to see them eating or drinking; in consequence every man and woman has a separate fire and does his or her own cooking.][8] It is extremely unusual

[1] W. W. Gill, *Jottings from the Pacific* (1885), p. 42.

[2] See, *e.g.*, F. Raymond *and* P. Janet, *Les obsessions et la psychasténie* (1903), ii. 386.

[3] K. von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasilien* (1894), p. 67.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

[5] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-42* (1845), iii. 349.

[6] E. Dieffenbach, *Travels in New Zealand* (1843), ii. 43-44.

[7] *Antananarivo Annual*, ii. 219.

[8] — Cameron, "The Anthropology of Africa," *J.A.I.* (1877), vi. 173.

for Nubians and the Niam-Niam to take any meals in common.[1] Among the latter people should they however drink together, they may be observed to wipe the rim of the cup before passing it on.[2] On the Loango coast, among numerous restrictions upon food, occurs a prohibition against eating in company with others.[3]

[Passing now to a series of cases in which the prohibition against commensal relations refers to a specific person, we have first a group in which that person is one superior (or inferior, according to the point of view) in rank to oneself.] The Maori gentleman eats in solitude.[4] In New Zealand a slave, therefore, may not eat with his master, nor even eat of the same food or cook at the same fire.[5] On one occasion a slave ate his chief's dinner by mistake; when told of what he had done, and when he realised that he had a tabooed person's "sacredness,"[6] he was seized with convulsions and cramp in the stomach, and died at sundown.[7] In Tonga there are ranks and orders that can neither eat nor drink together,[8] for here inferiors and superiors may not have commensal relations.[9] The Tuitonga may not eat in the presence of older members of his family.[10] If a native of Tonga has touched a superior chief or anything belonging to him, he may not feed himself with his own hands. Should he do so, he

[1] G. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa* (1873), i. 447.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii., 19.

[3] A. Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an die Loango- Küste* (1874-1875), i. 172.

[4] W. Yate, *An Account of New Zealand* (1835), p. 20.

[5] E. Shortland, *Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders* (1854), p. 106.

[6] *Id.*, *Maori Religion and Mythology* (1832), p. 26.

[7] [F. E. Maning], *Old New Zealand* (1863), p. 114.

[8] W. Mariner, *An Account of Natives of the Tonga Islands* (1817), ii. 234.

[9] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde* (1834-1835), ii. 77.

[10] *Ibid.*, ii. 77.

will infallibly swell up and die.[1] Still in Tonga, no one may see the king eat; therefore those present turn their backs upon him. Nor may one eat in his presence without averting the face.[2] Indeed, it is also forbidden to eat in the presence of a superior relation without turning the back.[3] In the Sandwich Islands no one could eat with the chief, who was "sacred."[4] In Fiji anyone who has touched a chief, living or dead, becomes taboo; he cannot handle food, but must be fed by others. Hence barbers are continually in this case.[5] The food of a Fijian chief may not be carried by boys who have not been tattooed, lest the meat be rendered "unclean," boys being "unclean" until then.[6] In Uripiv of the New Hebrides the males are divided into ten "castes" corresponding to age in life; promotion is marked by a change of name. The members of each "caste" mess together and may not eat with others. Unmarried mess-mates also sleep together.[7] Amongst the Alfoers of Celebes the priest who is responsible for the growth of the rice may not during his office eat or drink with anyone, nor drink out of another's cup.[8] It is forbidden in Wetar to eat or drink anything out of vessels used by the chiefs.[9]

[1] W. Mariner, *op. cit.*, i. 150; ii. 80.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii. 235.

[3] J. Cook, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean* (1784), i. 232.

[4] C. de Varigny, *Quatorze ans aux Iles Sandwich* (1874), p. 13.

[5] J. E. Erskine, *Journal of a Cruise among the Islands of the Western Pacific* (1853), p. 254.

[6] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *op. cit.*, i. 166.

[7] B. T. Somerville, "Notes on some Islands of the New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 6-7.

[8] W. Hoezoo, "Over het doen overkomen van inlanders naar Nederland," *Nededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenoetschap* (1867), xi. 126.

[9] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 455.

In Cambodia people will not eat with a priest.[1] In Burma one is defiled by sitting or eating with the "impure" caste of Sandalas.[2] In Ceylon, under the Kandyan dynasty, a lady was degraded from her caste by a low-caste Rodiya transferring betel from his own mouth to hers; the degradation was considered indelible. There were two lower castes than the Rodiyas, who were so despised that no human being would touch rice cooked in their houses.[3] The ancient Brahmin who ate the food of "outcasts" became thereby an "outcast" himself.[4] In modern India still "eating together is one of the grand tests of identity of caste."[5] Members of different castes will not eat food cooked in the same vessel; if a person of another caste touch a cooking vessel, it must be thrown away.[6] Further, a Hindu must take precautions "to insulate himself, as it were, during his meal, lest he be contaminated by the touch of some undetected sinner who may be present."[7] On the other hand, the Santals hate the Hindus, and will not receive food from their hands.[8] The Pahrias regard themselves as superior to the Keriahs, with whom they may neither eat nor drink.[9] If anyone ate the Mikado's food, his mouth would swell up and death would ensue.[10] A carved and gilt wooden screen

[1] É. Aymonier, "Note sur les coutumes et croyances superstitieuses des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine française* (1887), vi. 170.

[2] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde* (1834-1835), i. 173.

[3] Sir J. E. Tennent, *Ceylon* (1860), ii. 189.

[4] *The Laws of Manu*, xi. 176, 181; W. Ward, *A View of the History, Literature, and Religion of the Hindoos* (1817-1820), ii. 149.

[5] S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore* (1883), p. 331.

[6] W. Ward, *op. cit.*, ii. 317.

[7] H. T. Colebrooke, "The Religious Ceremonies of the Hindus," *Asiatick Researches* (1801), vii. 277.

[8] H. B. Rowney, *The Wild Tribes of India* (1882), p. 74.

[9] V. Ball, *Jungle Life in India* (1880), p. 89.

[10] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *op. cit.*, i. 386.

was always placed in front of Montezuma at his meals, that no one might see him while eating.[1]

The King of Susa at meals is concealed by a curtain from his guests.[2] In Ashanti a man of consequence never drinks before his inferiors without hiding his face from them. The belief is that an enemy can then "impose a spell on the faculties" of the man who is drinking.[3] In Dahomey it is death to see the king eat; if he drinks in public, a curtain is held up to conceal him.[4] Amongst the Niam-Niam the king takes his meals in private; no one may see the contents of his dish and everything that he leaves is carefully thrown into a pit set apart for the purpose. All that he handles is held as "sacred," and may not be touched; and a guest, though of higher rank, may not so much as light his pipe with embers from the king's fire.[5] The King of Congo eats and drinks in secret. If a dog should enter the house while the king is at table, it is killed. On one occasion the king's son, having accidentally seen his father drinking, was executed on the spot.[6] A crier proclaimed when the King of Cacongo was about to eat or drink, that the people might cover their faces or fall to the ground with down-turned eyes.[7] In Loango the king is sacred; from his birth he is forbidden to eat with anyone, and various foods are prohibited to him. He eats and drinks alone, in huts devoted to the purpose. The

[1] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America* (1875-1876), iii. 129.

[2] Sir W. C. Harnis, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), iii. 78.

[3] T. E. Bowdich, *Mission from Cape Coast Castle to Ashanti* (1819), p. 438.

[4] J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa* (1856), p. 202; W. W. Reade, *Savage Africa* (1863), p. 53; Sir R. F. Burton, *A Mission to Gelele, King of Dahomey* (1864), i. 244.

[5] G. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa* (1873), ii. 98.

[6] W. W. Reade, *op. cit.*, p. 359.

[7] A. Bastian, *Ein Besuch in San Salvador* (1859), p. 58.

covered dishes containing his food are preceded by a crier, at whose proclamation all get out of the way and bolt their doors; for any person seeing the king eat is put to death. A privileged few may be present, but they are bound to conceal their faces, or the king places a robe over his head. All that leaves his table is at once buried.[1] The black Jews of Loango are so despised that no one will eat with them.[2] A Pongo chief never drinks in the presence of others without a screen to conceal him;[3] on the Pongo coast it is believed that no one is more liable to witchcraft than when eating, drinking or sleeping.[4] When the King of Canna was offered a glass of rum by Mr Winwoode Reade, he hid his face and the glass under a Turkish towel.[5] The King of the Monbuttu always takes his meals in private, and no one may see the contents of his dish.[6] The King of Abyssinia always dines alone.[7]

The basis of this preference for eating in solitude is the animal egoistic impulse; later it becomes altruistic and also is combined, as we have seen this egoistic sensibility always combined, with general ideas about contact and transmission of properties.[8] The modern small boy who eats his cake in a corner still shows the most primitive form of the custom. [Before proceeding to manifestations of these principles which are connected

[1] A. Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an die Loango-Küste* (1874-1875), i. 220, 262-263.

[2] *Ibid.*, i. 278.

[3] J. L. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 308.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 310.

[5] W. W. Reade, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

[6] G. Schweinfurth, *op. cit.*, ii. 98.

[7] Sir W. C. Harris, *op. cit.*, iii. 171-172, 232.

[8] [Dr Seligmann, *Die Zauberkraft des Auges und das Berufen* (1922), pp. 379-380, has misunderstood this explanation, and places against it a theory according to which the phenomena we are considering would be due to a fear of the evil eye, a factor for which due allowance is here made: see below i. 197.]

with sexual taboo, there fall to be considered a few cases of prohibition against having commensal relations with persons who are liable to transmit specific evil properties.]

In New Zealand one can be "bewitched" by eating or drinking from the calabash of an ill-wisher or by smoking his pipe. Personal misfortunes are attributed to such indiscretions. When a man is sick he is invariably questioned by the doctor, for example, whose pipe he smoked last.[1] Anyone who has touched a dead body may not use his hands to eat, but is either fed by others or picks up his food with his teeth from the ground or the food-basket. Those who feed such a person offer the food with outstretched arm, and are careful not to touch him.[2] In Samoa while a dead body is in the house, no food may be eaten under the same roof; meals are taken outside or in another house. Those who attend upon the dead dare not handle their food, but are fed for some days by others. The penalty for breaking this rule is baldness and loss of teeth.[3] In Tahiti all who are employed in embalming the dead were during the process carefully avoided by every one, as "the guilt of the crime for which the deceased has died was supposed in some degree to attach to such as touched the body. They did not feed themselves, lest the food, defiled by the touch of their polluted hands, should cause their own death, but were fed by others."[4] In Fiji persons who suspect others of plotting against them avoid eating in their presence.[5] In the Mulgrave Is-

[1] J. S. Polack, *Manners and Customs of the New Zealanders* (1840), i. 280, 263.

[2] W. Brown, *New Zealand and its Aborigines* (1845), p. 11.

[3] G. Turner, *Samoa a Hundred Years ago and long before* (1884), p. 145; *id.*, *Nineteen Years in Polynesia* (1861), p. 228. Cp. C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stilles Oceans* (1875-1876), ii. 276, 300; iii. 40.

[4] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), iv. 388.

[5] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 249.

lands those who are not initiated ought never to drink from the same cup with sorcerers.[1] In ancient India a Brahmin might not eat the food of an enemy or of an ungrateful man, or that offered by an angry, sick or intoxicated person.[2] Cadiack whalers are considered "unclean," and no one will eat out of the same dish with them, or even approach them, for that reason.[3] No respectable Zulu would eat in the company of Amatongas, who are regarded as "evil-doers."[4]

We next are met by familiar extensions of the principle of contagion. The prohibition against eating and drinking before the eyes of others is an outcome of that universal appreciation of the power of the human gaze which has reached its most superstitious development in the belief in the Evil Eye. The idea is still that of contagion, for facts show the belief that malignance and other properties can be conveyed by a look as certainly as by other methods of infection, and thus taint the food and drink of the individual who fears. The Oriental belief that food is rendered poisonous by the Evil Eye is a luminous instance. In Abyssinia the doors are carefully barred before meals to exclude the Evil Eye, and a fire is lighted, otherwise "devils" will enter, and "there will be no blessing on the meat."[5] Amongst the Nubians no food is carried without being carefully covered, for fear of the Evil Eye.[6] A Khol will leave off eating if a man's shadow passes across the dishes.[7]

[1] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde* (1834-1835), ii. 408.

[2] *The Laws of Manu*, iv. 207, 213-214.

[3] U. Lisiansky, *A Voyage Round the World* (1814), p. 174.

[4] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), p. 115.

[5] Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), iii. 171-172.

[6] G. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa* (1873), ii. 326.

[7] H. B. Rowney, *The Wild Tribes of India* (1882), p. 65.

It is clear that men believe human properties to be transmitted not only by contact with the food of others, but by eating with them or in their presence, an idea which still lurks, if subconsciously, in the modern mind. The altruistic development of these ideas is also to be observed. As always in connection with contact, the tendency is for any human emanation to be regarded as in itself undesirable, and with the growth of intellect and refinement such emanations are, as animal characteristics, brought into the sphere of disgust, not only altruistic but individualistic also. The altruistic form is in principle, it will be observed, closely connected with the ideas of *ngadhungi;* to eat another's food is a real injury to him, in all the primitive sense of the word "real." In New Zealand, to eat a man's food was a gross insult; it was equivalent to eating the man himself, or his "sacredness."[1]

In sexual as in social taboo generally these beliefs have had a remarkable influence. The widely spread rule of sexual taboo that men and women may not eat together, is, as are taboos of commensality generally, in origin a form of egoistic sensitiveness with regard to the most important vital function; sexual separation and sexual solidarity build upon this, and the general ideas of contact applied to sexual relations develop a superstitious fear that the contact, whether by contagion or infection or otherwise, of food with the person, or influence of the female, transmits to the male the properties of woman, and, though this is not so much in evidence, food "infected" by males transmits to the female the properties of the male, and the rule becomes

[1] E. Shortland, *Maori Religion and Mythology* (1882), p. 26.

a complete taboo. It is to be observed that the prohibition has several variations: for instance, women may not enter the cooking-house of the men, and men may not eat those kinds of food used by women, in some cases by a natural extension, not even female animals.

[We may begin with cases in which the prohibition against commensal relations between the sexes, and kindred phenomena, apply under special circumstances, whatever these may be.] In Ceram men during mourning may not eat the females of deer and certain other animals.[1] Here also, and in Gorong, wives at the *catamenia* may not prepare their husband's food.[2] In the Aru Islands menstruous women may not plant, cook, or prepare any food.[3] In the islands Luang and Sermata the husband gives a feast after a birth at which only women may be present. It is believed that any man tasting the food will be unlucky in all his undertakings.[4] Amongst the Motu of New Guinea when a man is *helega*, for example after touching a dead body, he lives apart from his wife and may not eat the food that she has cooked.[5] In Fiji a wife when pregnant may not wait upon her husband.[6] Amongst the Maoris, if a man touched a menstruous woman, he would be taboo; if he had connection with her or ate food cooked by her, he would be "*tapu* an inch thick."[7]

The fact that the prohibition occurs at puberty serves to bring into relief the idea that danger from the other sex is apprehended at this period. Amongst the Kurnai

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 142.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 209. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 178. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 326.

[5] W. G. Lawes, "Ethnological Notes on the Motu, Koitapu and Koiari Tribes of New Guinea," *J.A.I.* (1879), viii. 370.

[6] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 137.

[7] E. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *J.A.I.* (1890), xix. 101.

of Gippsland a "novice" may not eat female animals; he becomes free of the forbidden food by degrees, in this way: the old man suddenly comes behind him and without warning smears the fat of the cooked animal over his face.[1] Amongst the Narrinyeri, boys during the progress of "initiation," which is not complete until the beard has been pulled out three times, and each time has been allowed to grow to the length of two inches, are forbidden to eat any food which belongs to women. They are forbidden to eat with women "lest they grow ugly or become grey."[2] This belief is instructive, as showing how the superstitious fear of the other sex may exist side by side with a desire to please, or even give rise to means thereto.

In Western Victoria a menstruous woman may not take anyone's food or drink, and no one will touch food that has been touched by her, "because it will make them weak."[3] In Queensland menstruous women are "unclean," and no one will touch a dish which they have used.[4] Buddhist monks in Burma may not eat food cooked by female hands; if a female offers rice, they may accept but not eat.[5] A Brahmin might not allow himself to be touched by a menstruous woman, or to eat food offered by a woman.[6] Amongst the Veddas of Travancore the wife at menstruation leaves the house for ten days; when she comes back he in turn has to leave until certain ceremonies are performed; for four days after

[1] A. W. Howitt, "The Jeraeil, or Initiation Ceremonies of the Kurnai," *J.A.I.* (1885), xiv. 316.

[2] G. Taplin, "The Narrinyeri," in *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (1879), pp. 17, 69.

[3] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1881), pp. ci-cii.

[4] C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals* (1889), p. 119.

[5] Shway Yoe [*i.e.*, Sir J. G. Scott], *The Burman* (1882), i. 136.

[6] *The Laws of Manu*, iv. 208, 211.

his return he may not eat rice in his own house, nor have connection with his wife.[1] Amongst the tribes of the Oxus valley the mother is "unclean" for seven days after a birth, and no one will eat from her hand, nor may she suckle her infant during that period.[2] The cook of the King of Angoy was expected to keep himself pure, and might not even live with a wife.[3] The Indians of Guiana believe that, if a pregnant woman eat of game caught by hounds they will never be able to hunt again.[4] Amongst the tribes on the Amazon, if a pregnant woman eat any particular meat, it is believed that any animal partaking of the same will suffer; a domestic animal will die, a hound will be rendered incapable of hunting, and a man who eats such food will never again be able to shoot that particular animal.[5] A Yucatan "Captain" during his three years of office, might know no woman, nor might his food be served by women.[6] Algonkin priests, who are ordained to a life of chastity, may not even eat food prepared by a married woman.[7] This case, in common with one or two others in this series, shows that individuals in a state of danger or solemn service, in other words under taboo, as for instance priests, have especially reason to avoid female contagion. A Kaniagmut woman is "unclean" for some days both after delivery and menstruation; no one in either case may

[1] M. Bartels, "Abnorne Behaarung beim Menschen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1879), xi. 164.

[2] J. Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh* (1880), p. 81.

[3] A. Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an die Loango-Küste* (1874-1875), i. 216.

[4] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana* (1883), p. 233.

[5] A. R. Wallace, *Travels on the Amazon and Rio Negro* (1853), p. 501.

[6] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America* (1875-1876), ii. 741.

[7] *Ibid.*, ii. 212.

touch her, and she is fed with food at the end of a stick.[1]

[Finally we come to examples of the prohibition against commensal relations between the sexes as it applies in ordinary life.] The Warua of Central Africa will not let anyone see them eat or drink, especially those of the opposite sex. "I could not," says Cameron, "make a man let a woman see him drink." Hence every person has his own fire, and both men and women must cook for themselves.[2] On the Loango coast both bride and bridegroom must make a full confession of their sins at the marriage ceremony of *Lemba;* should either fail to do so, or keep anything back, they will fall ill when eating together as man and wife. Only such marriages as are performed in the presence of the fetish *Lemba* are legitimate; a negro dares not let any of his wives, except the one thus married, cook his food or look after his wardrobe. This fetish also serves to keep the wives in order and to punish them for infidelity.[3] In Eastern Central Africa, when a wife has been guilty of unchastity, her husband will die if he taste any food that she has salted. As a consequence of this superstition, a wife is very liable to be accused of killing her husband. Accordingly, when a wife prepares her husband's food, she will often get a little girl to put the salt in.[4] Amongst the Braknas of West Africa husbands and wives do not eat together.[5] Fulah women may not eat with their

[1] W. H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources* (1870), p. 403; H. H. Bancroft, *op. cit.*, i. 111.

[2] — Cameron, "The Anthropology of Africa," *J.A.I.* (1877), vi. 173.

[3] A. Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an die Loango-Küste* (1874-1875), i. 170, 172.

[4] D. Macdonald, *Africana* (1882), i. 173.

[5] A. Giraud-Teulon, *Les origines du mariage et de la famille* (1884), p 107.

husbands.[1] In Ashanti [2] and Senegambia,[3] amongst the Niam-Niam [4] and the Barea,[5] the wife never eats with the husband. Amongst the Beni-Amer a wife never eats in the presence of her husband.[6] Amongst the Krumen the chief wife only may eat with the husband.[7] In Eastern Central Africa each village has a separate mess for males and females.[8] This prohibition is very general throughout Africa.

In Egypt the wives and female slaves are not allowed to eat with the master.[9] Amongst the Aeneze Arabs husband and wife do not eat together.[10] The women of the Druses of the Lebanon may not eat with the male members of the family.[11] The Beni-Harith would not eat or drink at the hands of a woman, and "would rather have died of hunger than break the rule."[12] Herodotus states that Carian women did not eat with their husbands, nor would they address them as "husband."[13] Amongst the Kurds husband and wife never eat together.[14] A

[1] G. T. Mollien, *Voyage dans l'intérieur de l'Afrique aux sources du Sénégal et de la Gambie* (1820), i. 171-173; *Voyage sur la cote et dans l'intérieur de l'Afrique Occidentale* (1853), p. 324.

[2] J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa* (1856), p. 182.

[3] W. W. Reade, *Savage Africa* (1863), p. 453.

[4] D. Macdonald, *op. cit.*, i. 227.

[5] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien* (1864), p. 526.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 325.

[7] T. Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* (1859-1872), ii. 110.

[8] D. Macdonald, *Africana* (1882), i. 151.

[9] E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (1871), i. 236, 243.

[10] J. L. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wáhábys* (1830), p. 64.

[11] G. W. Chasseaud, *The Druses of the Lebanon* (1855), p. 77.

[12] W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* (1885), p. 312.

[13] Herodotus, *History*, i. 146.

[14] P. delle Valle, "Travels in Persia," *in* J. Pinkerton, *A General Collection of Voyages and Travels* (1808-1814), ix. 15.

Samoyed woman may not eat with men, much less with her husband, whose leavings form her meals.[1]

A Hindu wife never eats with her husband, for if a Hindu's "own wife were to touch the food he was about to eat, it would be rendered unfit for his use."[2] So in ancient India, according to Manu, "let him not eat in the company of his wife."[3] A Brahmin might not eat food given by a woman, or by those "who are in all things ruled by women," nor might he eat the leavings of women.[4] In Travancore the women must eat after the men.[5] Amongst the Khonds the wife and children wait upon the master while he eats, then they may take their meal. Women may not eat hog's flesh, and may only taste liquor at intervals.[6] The men and women of Kumaun eat separately.[7] Amongst the hill tribes near Rajmahal in Bengal, the women are not allowed to eat with the men.[8] Amongst the Todas men and women may not eat together.[9] At a Santal wedding the bride and bridegroom eat together after fasting all day; this is the first time she has eaten with a man.[10] In Cochin a wife never eats with her husband.[11] A Siamese wife prepares her husband's meals, but dines after him.[12] In the

[1] A. Bastian, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (1860), iii. 295.

[2] H. T. Colebrooke, "The Religious Ceremonies of the Hindus," *Asiatick Researches* (1801), vii. 166.

[3] *The Laws of Manu*, iv. 43. [4] *Ibid.*, xi. 153; iv. 217.

[5] S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore* (1883), p. 204; *id.*, *The Land of Charity* (1871), p. 65.

[6] S. C. Macpherson, *Memorials of Service in India* (1865), p. 72.

[7] H. Rivett-Carnac, in *Panjab Notes and Queries* (1884-1885), ii. 74-75, note 454.

[8] T. Shaw, "The Inhabitants of the Hills near Rájmahall," *Asiatick Researches* (1795), iv. 59

[9] W. E. Marshall, *A Phrenologist amongst the Todas* (1873), p. 82.

[10] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (1872), p. 216.

[11] A. Bastian, *Allerlei aus Volks- und Menschenkunde* (1888), ii. 160

[12] F. R. Turpin, "History of Siam," *in* J. Pinkerton, *A General Collection of Voyages and Travels* (1808-1814), ix. 585.

Andamans bachelors may only eat with the male sex, and spinsters with female .[1] In the Maldive Islands husband and wife may not eat together.[2] The same rule is in force amongst the Khakyens.[3] In China by marriage a woman "only changes masters"; the wife neither eats with her husband nor with her male children; she waits upon them at table; she may not touch what her son leaves.[4] In Korea men and women have their meals separately, the women waiting on the men.[5]

Amongst the Indians of Guiana husbands and wives eat separately.[6] Macusi women eat after the men.[7] Amongst the Bororo women and children eat after the men, and finish their leavings.[8] In ancient Mexico each person had a separate bowl for eating; the men ate first and by themselves, the women and children afterwards.[9] In Yucatan men and women ate apart.[10] "So far as I have yet travelled in the Indian country," says Catlin, "I have never yet seen an Indian woman eating with her husband. Men form the first group at the banquet, and women and children and dogs all come together at the next."[11] Amongst the Iroquois tribes the men ate first and by themselves, then the women and children took

[1] Sir H. B. Frere, "The Laws affecting the Relations between Civilised and Savage Life," *J.A.I.* (1882), xi. 344.

[2] C. W. Rosset, "The Maldive Islands," *J.A.I.* (1887), xvi. 168.

[3] J. W. Anderson, *Notes of Travel in Fiji and New Caledonia* (1880), p. 137.

[4] E. R. Huc, *L'Empire Chinois* (1854), i. 268.

[5] H. B. Saunderson, "Notes on Corea and its People," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 306.

[6] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana* (1883), p. 256; W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana* (1868), p. 28.

[7] W. H. Brett, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[8] K. von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens* (1894), p. 215.

[9] L. H. Morgan, *Houses and House-life of the American Aborigines* (1881), p. 101.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 103.

[11] G. Catlin, *Illustrations of the Manners, Customs, and Conditions of the North-American Indians* (1876), i. 202.

their meals alone.[1] Of these people it has been said that the women "must approach their lords with reverence; they must regard them as exalted beings, and are not permitted to eat in their presence."[2] So amongst many other tribes of North Indians.[3] The Seneca Indians relate of the changes in their customs resulting from the innovations of the whites, "that when the proposition that man and wife should eat together, which was so contrary to immemorial usage, was first determined in the affirmative, it was formally agreed that man and wife should sit down together at the same dish and eat with the same ladle, the man eating first and then the woman, and so alternately until the meal was finished."[4] Amongst the Natchez the husband used a respectful attitude towards his wife, and addressed her as if he were her slave; he did not eat with her.[5] An Eskimo wife dares not eat with her husband.[6] Amongst the California Indians husbands and wives eat separately; they may not even cook at the same fire.[7]

The rule is general throughout Australia that husband and wife must eat separately; the *gin* never eats until the man has finished, and then she eats his leavings. Thus in Victoria males and females have separate fires at which they cook their own food. Many of the best

[1] L. H. Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

[2] W. Robertson, *The History of America* (1777), i. 178.

[3] See *e.g.*, S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean* (1796), p. 90.

[4] L. H. Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

[5] P. F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire et description generale de la Nouvelle France* (1744), iii. 423.

[6] Sir J. Ross, *Narrative of a Second Voyage in Search of a North-West Passage* (1835), p. 578.

[7] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America* (1875-1876), i. 390.

kinds of food are forbidden to women.[1] In the tribes of Western Victoria boys are not allowed to eat any female quadruped. If they are caught eating a female opossum, for instance, they are severely punished; the reason given is that such food makes them peevish and discontented;[2] in other words, it gives them the failings which a black fellow ascribes to the female sex. Amongst the Kurnai of Gippsland men may only eat the males of the animals which they use for food.[3] The Port Lincoln tribe observes certain laws about animal food, the general principle of which is this: that the male of any animal should be eaten by grown-up men, the female by women, and the young animal by children only.[4] In Queensland the husband, as in Victoria, reserves the best food for himself.[5] In Central Australia the men and women eat and camp separately.[6]

Amongst the Arfaks of New Guinea the men and women eat apart.[7] Amongst the Kayans and Punans of Borneo the men feed alone, attended on by the women.[8] The Dyaks of North-West Borneo forbid their young men and warriors to eat venison, which is the food of women and old men, because it would make them as timid as deer.[9] Amongst the Battas of Sumatra husband and wife may not eat from the same dish.[10] [The

[1] R. B. Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria* (1878), i. 134.

[2] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1881), p. 52.

[3] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), p. 197.

[4] C. W. Schürmann, "The Aboriginal Tribes of Port Lincoln in South Australia," in *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (1879), p. 220.

[5] C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals* (1889), p. 161.

[6] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 467, 469.

[7] L. M. d'Albertis, *New Guinea* (1880), i. 218.

[8] C. Hose, "The Natives of Borneo," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 160.

[9] S. St John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East* (1868), i. 186, 206.

[10] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), i. 117.

Orang-Laut women do not eat before men.][1] In the Mentawey Islands the man eats alone in the house ; the women are forbidden to use many kinds of food.[2] In the islands, Wetar and Dama, women may not eat with the men ;[3] in Romang husbands take their meals at the same time but separately.[4] Men and women may not eat together in Halmahera.[5]

In Melanesia generally, women may not eat with men.[6] In the Solomon Islands husband and wife do not eat together ; she prepares his meal, and when he has finished she eats what he has left.[7] In the Banks Islands all the adult males belong to the men's club, *Suqe*, where they take their meals, while the women and children eat at home.[8] In Tanna women may not eat with men, they may not drink *kava*, nor share in the *kava*-drinking feasts of the men.[9] In the New Hebrides generally, women always eat apart from the men.[10] In Uripiv "the most noticeable features of domestic life will be found in the curious segregation of the sexes and the superstitious dread of eating anything female. A few days after birth a killing of pigs takes place and the child is 'rated a man.' Henceforward he must cook his own meals at his own fire, and eat with men alone, otherwise death will mysteri-

[1] H. V. Stevens, "Mittheilungen aus den Frauenleben der Ôrang Bĕlendas, des Ôrang Djâkun und der Ôrang Lâut," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1896), xxviii. 167.

[2] C. B. H. von Rosenberg, *Der Malayische Archipel* (1878), p. 196.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 458.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 464.

[5] *Id.*, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 59.

[6] See *e.g.*, C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans* (1875-1876), i. 67.

[7] H. B. Guppy, *The Solomon Islands* (1887), p. 41.

[8] R. H. Codrington, "Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia," *J.A.I.* (1881), x. 273.

[9] G. Turner, *Nineteen Years of Polynesia* (1861), p. 85.

[10] C. E. Meinicke, *op. cit.*, i. 197.

ously fall upon him. The fact of his being suckled, however, which often goes on for two years, is quite overlooked."[1] [Meli men make their food in their own club-house, which is tabooed to women; anything that a woman cooks is unclean to a man; only in childhood is a boy allowed to eat with his mother.][2] In Malekula men and women cook their meals separately, and even at separate fires, and all female animals, even hens and eggs, are forbidden articles of diet. A native told Lieutenant Somerville that a mate of his had died from partaking of sow.[3] In New Caledonia women may not eat with the men.[4] In Fiji husband and wife may not eat together, nor brother nor sister, nor the two sexes generally.[5] Young men may not eat of food left by women.[6]

In Ponape the men take their meals in the club-house.[7] In Kuseie women may not eat with men owing to the taboo.[8] In Rarotonga the women ate apart from the men.[9] In the Hervey Islands husband and wife never eat together, and the first-born child, boy or girl, may not eat with any member of the family.[10] In Paumotu the women may not eat with the men, and are not allowed to eat several kinds of food, such as large fishes and turtles. These laws are enforced by the taboo.[11]

[1] B. T. Somerville, "Notes on some Islands of the New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 4.

[2] A. Baessler, *Südsee-Bilder* (1895), p. 203.

[3] B. T. Somerville, "Ethnological Notes on New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 381.

[4] C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans* (1875-1876), i. 231.

[5] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1872), i. 167.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 136.

[7] T. Waitz *and* G. Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* (1859-1872), vii. 72.

[8] C. E. Meinicke, *op. cit.*, ii. 377.

[9] *Ibid.*, ii. 143.

[10] W. W. Gill, *Life in the Southern Islands* [1876], p. 94.

[11] C. E. Meinicke, *op. cit.*, ii. 219.

So in Tubuai taboo forbids the women to eat with men, or to use as food turtles and pigs.[1] In the Marquesas Islands to each dwelling there is attached a special eating-house for the men, which the women are forbidden to enter.[2] In Nukahiva, according to another account, the rich have separate buildings for dining-rooms on particular occasions of feasting which women are not allowed to enter ; so strict is the rule, that they dare not even pass near them.[3] Women are forbidden *kava* and certain foods.[4] In Rurutua men and women do not eat together "owing to superstitious fear ; they believe that in such case the wife would be destroyed by a spirit."[5] In Bow Island the men threw the remains of their meals to their wives.[6] In Rotumah the men of the family eat first ; when they have finished, the women and children begin their meal at a separate table.[7]

In New Zealand, where every man eats by himself away from his friends, women and slaves may not eat with men.[8] Men may not eat with their wives, nor mothers with their male children, "lest their *tapu* or sanctity should kill them."[9] In the Sandwich Islands the king's wives were not allowed to enter his eating-house.[10] In Hawaii the women were forbidden to eat in

[1] C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans* (1875-1876), ii. 199.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii. 249.

[3] U. Lisiansky, *A Voyage Round the World* (1814), p. 87.

[4] C. E. Meinicke, *op. cit.*, ii. 252, 247.

[5] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), iii. 97-98.

[6] F. W. Beechey, *Narrative of a Voyage to the Pacific and Beering's Strait* (1831), i. 242.

[7] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde* (1834-1835), ii. 440.

[8] A. S. Thomson, *The Story of New Zealand* (1859), i. 60.

[9] R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui* (1870), p. 168.

[10] O. von Kotzebue, *A Voyage of Discovery into the South Seas and Beering's Straits* (1821), i. 305.

company with men, and even to enter the eating-room during meals. Three houses necessarily belonged to each family, the dwelling-house, a house for the repasts of the men and another for the meals of the women. The residence was in common ; the women's house was not closed against the male sex, but a decorous man would not enter it. The eating-house of the men was tabooed to the women. "We ourselves saw the corpse of a woman floating round our ship, who had been killed because she had entered the eating-house of her husband in a state of intoxication." The *raison d'être* of the two eating-houses belonging to each family was that the two sexes might not eat together. Women dared not be present at the meals of the men, on pain of death. Each sex had to dress their own victuals over a separate fire. The two sexes were not allowed to use the flesh of the same animal. Hog's flesh, turtle, several kinds of fruit, cocoa, bananas, and so forth, were prohibited to the women.[1] From another account of the Sandwich Islands we gather the following : women might not eat with men ; the houses and the labours of the sexes were distinct ; their aliment was prepared separately.[2] A female child from its birth until death was allowed no food that had touched the father's dish. "From childhood onwards no natural affections were inculcated ; no social circle existed."[3]

[Ellis's account of the state of things in the Society and Sandwich Islands is as follows : "The institutes of Oro and Tane inexorably require not only that

[1] U. Lisiansky, *A Voyage Round the World* (1814), pp. 126-127 ; O. von Kotzebue, *op. cit.*, i. 310, iii. 249 ; C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans* (1875-1876), ii. 300 ; H. T. Cheever, *Life in the Sandwich Islands* (1851), p. 24.

[2] J. J. Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands* (1843), pp. 94-95.

[3] C. de Varigny, *Quatorze ans aux Iles Sandwich* (1874), p. 42.

the wife should not eat those kinds of foods of which the husband partook, but that she should not eat in the same place or prepare her food at the same fire. This restriction applied not only to the wife with regard to her husband, but to all individuals of the female sex, from their birth to their death. The children of each sex always ate apart. As soon as a boy was able to eat, a basket was provided for his use, and his food was kept distinct from that of the mother. The men were allowed to eat the flesh of the pig, of fowls, every variety of fish, cocoa-nuts and bananas, and whatever was presented as an offering to the gods; these the females, on pain of death, were forbidden to touch, as it was supposed they would pollute them. The fires at which the men's food was cooked were also sacred, and were forbidden to be used by the females. The basket in which the provision was kept, and the house in which the men ate, were also sacred and prohibited to the females under the same cruel penalty. Hence the inferior food for the wives and daughters were cooked at separate fires, deposited in distinct baskets and eaten in lonely solitude by the females in little huts erected for the purpose. The whole custom was known as the *ai tabu* or 'sacred eating.'"[1]

Cook observed of the Sandwich Islands that "in their domestic life, the women live almost entirely by themselves."[2] This condition of family life was most noticeable in Tahiti. The Tahitians forbade men and women to eat together; they "had an aversion to holding any intercourse with each other at their meals, and they were so rigid in the observance of this custom that even

[1] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), i. 116, 129, 263, iv. 386; *id.*, *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii* (1826), p. 368.

[2] J. Cook, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean* (1784), iii. 130.

brothers and sisters had their separate baskets of provisions, and generally sat some yards apart, without exchanging a word."[1] To resume Ellis's account, "their domestic habits were unsocial and cheerless. This is probably to be attributed to the invidious distinction established by their superstitions, and enforced by *tabu* between the sexes. The father and mother, with their children, never, as one social happy band, surrounded the domestic hearth, or assembling under the grateful shade of the verdant grove, partook together, as a family, of the bounties of Providence. The nameless but delightful emotions experienced on such occasions were unknown to them, as well as all that we are accustomed to distinguish by the endearing appellation of domestic happiness. In sickness or pain, or whatever other circumstances the mother, the wife, the sister, or the daughter, might be brought into, *tabu* was never relaxed. The men, especially those who occasionally attended on the services of idol-worship in the temple, were considered *ra*, or sacred; while the female sex was considered *noa*, or common: the most offensive and frequent imprecations which the men were accustomed to use towards each other, referred also to this degraded condition of the females. 'Mayest thou become a bottle, to hold salt water for thy mother,' or 'mayest thou be baked as food for thy mother,' were imprecations they were accustomed to denounce upon each other."[2] Making due allowance for missionary prejudice, the action of sexual taboo in these islands had considerable results, and its meaning is shown in a marked fashion. King Kamehameha "broke" the taboo by eating with his wives.[3]

[1] G. Vancouver, *A Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean* (1798), i. 105 139.

[2] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), i. 129.

[3] C. de Varigny, *Quatorze ans aux Iles Sandwich* (1874), p. 42.

Cases of this taboo have even been found in modern Europe. At a Servian wedding the bride for the first and only time in her life eats with a man.[1] In Brandenburg it is believed that lovers and married people who eat from one plate or drink from one glass will come to dislike each other, and in the district of Fahrland, near Potsdam, there is a prohibition, which is observed, against such persons biting the same piece of bread.[2]

It was suggested by Robertson Smith that the prohibition against husbands and wives eating together may have been due to the fact that by exogamy they were of different tribes, and therefore could not eat the same food. But on the present showing this is impossible. In later thought, this idea may occasionally have been developed, but that it was never original is shown not only by the present evidence, but by the facts that the system of tribal, totemic and "classificatory" foods is rare, while sexual taboo in eating is almost universal, and that the taboo is no less common between brothers and sisters, who are of the same tribe, and also, except in rare cases, of the same totem-clan or marriage-class.

[1] Baron I. *and* Baroness O. von Reinsberg-Düringsfeld, *Hochzeitsbuch* (1871), p. 81.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 217.

CHAPTER VIII

SEXUAL RELATIONS

If contact of the two sexes is always potentially dangerous, owing to fear of the chief result of contact, contagion of properties, it is to be expected that to savage thought the dangers of contagion should be multiplied and deepened when the contact is of the most intimate kind possible. The savage regards intercourse commensal and sexual as the closest, and especially in marriage, of which state the sharing of *mensa* and *thorus* is the chief feature for ordinary thought. As commensality is regulated by this fear of contact, so is sexual intercourse. The ideas beneath each form of contact are the same. The supreme biological importance of the nutritive impulse, of which the sexual is an extension or complement, and the delicate mechanism of the organs of generation, have determined in the usual ratio man's psychological attitude towards this function. As all primitive psychological attitudes arise from what may be called physiological thought, the actual process of functions producing directly ideas concerning them, more or less reflex and subconscious, so as to be practically inherent in the human mind, so the depth of such ideas varies as the importance of the function. The impulse of sex is only less strong than that of hunger. Periodicity has assisted to make its psychological character less ordinary, and less of an everyday concern, and hence more shrouded in secrecy and more surrounded by mystery and fear. The instinct, as it may truly be

called, for performing important functions in secret is of course due to anxiety concerning their unimpeded observance, and to fear of interruption.[1]

This principle can be traced right down to the lower animals. The savage is far more secretive in this function than is civilised man ; what Riedel states of the Ceramese, is true of the generality of savage and barbarous peoples. In Ceram, he says, all natural functions, especially that of coition, are performed in secret, by preference in the forest.[2] Similarly in the Aru Islands[3] and in Wetar.[4] In Makisar all bodily functions are performed in secret, and exposure is reprehensible.[5] [In New Guinea propriety required that a man should not only not be seen with his wife, but that he should ignore her in public.][6] In Fiji, from motives of delicacy, "*rendezvous* between husband and wife are arranged in the depths of the forest, unknown to any but the two."[7] [The North American Indians dared to go to their wives' cabins only at night ; to go in the day-time would have been regarded as extraordinary.[8] The Indians of Brazil, according to an old traveller, "sleep with one another privately."][9] Bowdich states that in Western Africa if a man cohabited with a woman without the house or in the bush, they both become slaves of the first person who discovered

[1] [See above, i. 166-167.]

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 96.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 250. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 448. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 406.

[6] R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea* (1911), i. 161-162.

[7] B. Seemann, *Viti* (1862), pp. 110, 191. [This statement, as regards the Fijians has, however, since been contradicted by Sir Basil Thomson, *The Fijians* (1908), p. 202, who describes Seemann's observation as a mere fiction.]

[8] J. F. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages ameriquains comparées aux moeurs des premiers temps* (1724), i. 576.

[9] Sir R. F. Burton, *The Captivity of Hans Stade of Hesse, in A.D. 1547-1555, among the Wild Tribes of Eastern Brazil* (1874), p. 144.

them, though they could be redeemed by their families.[1] This less common rule presupposes more or less publicity in the bush.

The savage is also more refined in language with regard to this subject than are most civilised men ; thus in Ceram it is forbidden to speak of sexual matters in the presence of a third person.[2] [In the Bismarck Archipelago the sexual parts are only referred to by the use of euphemistic terms,[3] and there is the widely established alternative vocabulary used for sexual matters.[4] An extreme case is that of the natives inhabiting the Laur district in New Ireland, who, both males and females, are reported to sometimes commit suicide when indecently vituperated.][5] Obscenity, that fungus-growth of civilisation through degeneration or wrong methods of education, is either unknown amongst savages or regarded as a heinous sin. Ethnology supplies many cases of apparent obscenity, but the expressions are not obscene, they express a man's righteous and religious indignation, and have much the same force as "infidel" and "blasphemer" when used seriously.[6]

Again, the phenomena of modesty in the female deepen this reserve. Dr Ellis, who has given the best account of the origin of the feeling of modesty, points out the impulse in female animals and women "to guard the sexual centres against the undesired advances of the male. The naturally defensive attitude of the female is in contrast with the naturally aggressive attitude of the

[1] T. E. Bowdich, *Mission from Cape Coast Castle to Ashanti* (1819), p. 259.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

[3] Graf J. Pfeil, *Studien und Beobachtungen aus der Südsee* (1899), p. 74.

[4] H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1910), i. 67.

[5] E. Stephan *and* F. Graebner, *Neu-Mecklenburg* (1907), p. 110.

[6] [See E. A. Crawley, "Obscenity," *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (1917), ix. 441-444. Cp. *id.*, "Orgy," in *ibid.* (1917), ix. 557-558.]

male in sexual relationships."[1] ["That modesty—like all the closely-allied emotions—is based on fear, one of the most primitive of the emotions, seems to be fairly evident."][2] The impulse for defence is carried on into the state of desire, and female animals are known to run after the male, and "then turn to flee, perhaps only submitting with much persuasion." There is the well-known case of a hind running away from a stag, but in a circle round him. "Modesty thus becomes an invitation."[3]

Sexual taboo has emphasised the ideas arising from this functional process, by filling them with a content of religious fear. As to the psychological attitude of the male sex, we often find, especially in European folklore, the fear of a possible ligature or *impotentia conjugalis* at marriage, an anxiety coming straight from function and closely connected with the universal care, often passing into religious fear, about doing something for the first time, or something unusual or important.[4] Witches are often supposed to be able to cause this, as in South Celebes.[5]

This feeling of egoistic sensibility, again, connects closely with the widely spread idea underlying contact, that injury may be caused by the ill-will or dangerous habit of another, either with or without intention, either by the means of sympathetic magic or of what may be called sympathy. This form of sympathetic magic to which we apply the term *ngadhungi*[6] is, as we have seen, a natural development of that simple idea of contagion which

[1] H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1910), i. 29.

[2] *Ibid.*, i. 36. For the connection of modesty with disgust, see above, i. 172-174.

[3] *Ibid.*, i. 29.

[4] [See above, i. 22 *et seq.*]

[5] B. F. Matthes, *Bijdragen tot de Ethnologie van Zuider-Celebes* (1875), p. 97.

[6] [See above, i. 153 *et seq.*]

may be called sympathy, man using nature's "bacteriological" or "electrical" means for his own ends. As is the case with every physical function and organ, so against the organs of generation this method can be used. In Ceram difficult labour for women, and in men, impotence, are caused by putting disease-transmitting articles where people may tread on them.[1] In Tanna and Malekula "the closest secrecy is adopted with regard to the *penis*, not at all from a sense of decency, but to avoid *narak*, the sight even of that of another man being considered most dangerous. They therefore wrap it round with many yards of calico, winding and folding them until a preposterous bundle eighteen inches or two feet long is formed.[2] We have here the not infrequent converse of the evil eye: to see a thing is a method by which one may contract its contagious properties.

Of the Arunta Messrs Spencer and Gillen report that "as a general rule, women are not supposed to be able to exercise much magic except in regard to the sexual organs, but we have known of a woman being speared to death by the brother of her husband, who accused her of having killed the latter by means of a pointing stick. Women exercise peculiar powers in regard to the sexual organs. To bring on a painful affection in those of men, a woman will procure the spear-like seed of a long grass (*Inturkirra*), and having charmed it by singing some magic chant over it, she waits an opportunity to point and throw it towards the man whom she desires to injure. Shortly after this has been done the man experiences pain, as if he had been stung by ants; his parts

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 140.

[2] B. T. Somerville, "Ethnological Notes on New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 368.

become swollen and he at once attributes his sufferings to the magic influence of some woman who wishes to injure him. A woman may also charm a handful of dust which she collects while out digging up yams or gathering seeds, and having 'sung' it brings it into camp with her. She takes the opportunity of sprinkling it over a spot where the man whom she wishes to injure is likely to micturate. If he should do so at this spot he would experience a scalding sensation in the *urethra*, and afterwards suffer a great amount of pain. Women may also produce disease in men by 'singing' over and thus charming a finger, which is then inserted in the *vulva*; the man who subsequently has connection with her will become diseased and may lose his organs altogether, and so when a woman wishes to injure a man she will seek an opportunity of soliciting him, though he be not her proper *Unawa*. Syphilitic disease amongst the Arunta is, as a matter of fact, very frequently attributed to this form of magic, for it must be remembered that the native can only understand disease of any form as due to evil magic, and he has to provide what appears to him to be a suitable form of magic to account for each form of disease.[1] The disease *Erkincha*, as we have noticed,[2] is transmitted in the same way. The natives do not reason "from a strictly medical point of view; their idea in a case of this kind is that a man suffering from *Erkincha* conveys a magic evil influence which they call *Arungquiltha* to the women, and by this means it is conveyed as a punishment to other men."[3]

As in other forms of contact, so in this, the trans-

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* 1899), pp. 547-548.

[2] [Above, i. 113.]

[3] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *op. cit.*, p. 412.

mission of disease is included in the hylo-idealistic contagion of properties, though it is not the origin of these ideas. Similarly, amongst the Zulus, a man suspicious of his wife's fidelity gets "medicine" from a doctor and takes it internally. By cohabiting with his wife he gives her the seed of disease, and anyone having relations with her afterwards, acquires it, while she remains uninjured.[1] They also have a "medicine" which can make a man sensitive to the existence of that state in a woman which can produce disease; it is rubbed into a scarification on the back of the left hand. If a woman whom he approaches is in the dangerous state, a spasmodic contraction attacks his fingers when he touches her and he therefore abstains. "It is from dread of this 'disease' that a man will not marry a widow till she has had medical treatment to remove all possibility of communicating it."[2] The "intention" is in this example well illustrated, being aimed at a third party, and leaving the intermediary free, and also being clearly a man's vengeance materialised and transmitted.

As has been pointed out,[3] *ngadhungi* (*narak*) and beneficent transmission are exactly the same except in the character of the "intention" which is evil in the former case and good in the latter, and love-charms proper, used to inspire love, are frequently based on this method. A man or woman in the Arunta and other tribes can charm another's love by "singing" a head-band, which is then given to the person to wear; a man can inspire a woman's love by "singing" the shell ornament he wears from his girdle. As they express the result, the woman sees "lightning" on it, and it makes "her inwards shake with

[1] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), p. 287.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 288.
[3] [Above, i. 157.]

emotion."[1] The idealism of love and its physiological accompaniments are here put in a way worthy of any high culture. It is to be observed that this same method is used to cure sickness, the shell ornament being placed on the sick man's chest.[2]

To inspire love, the people of Makiser place secret charms in the footprints of a man or woman, as the case may be.[3] In the Kei Islands herbs mixed with women's hair and hung on a tree are used for this. The women arouse love in the men by charming betel which they have themselves prepared.[4] Sympathetic charms are used by men and women in Buru to excite love. One takes some betel or tobacco, and after speaking a charm over it, places it in the betel-box. When the man or woman against whom the charm is directed makes use of this betel, he or she falls in love with the owner. The same effect is produced by muttering charms over the oil which the woman uses for her hair, or over a piece of hair one has got from a woman. The most potent method, however, is the burying of a piece of prepared ginger, with the muttering of one's desire, in some spot where the woman usually passes.[5] In Tenimber the men make considerable use of charms to engage the women's affections. To this end they place a mixture of roots and lime on some spot where the woman has urinated. It is believed that the women after a short time will fall madly in love with the man. Young men are therefore forbidden to use lime.[6] In the Babar Islands, when a quarrel occurs between lovers, the man avenges himself by keeping a piece of her hair, or some bit of betel she has

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *op. cit.*, p. 545. [2] *Idd.*, *loc. cit.*

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 414.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 223. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 11. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 302.

thrown away. Afterwards, as a result, her children by another man will die.[1] Lovers in these islands have full intimacy, but it must be kept secret, for there is a fine attaching. It is believed that men, if fined, are ungallant enough to make the woman ill and unlucky by curses.[2] Lovers in the Aru Islands give each other gifts, but never a lock of hair, for fear that if they quarrelled the one might make the other ill by burning it.[3]

For love-charms Arunta women also "make and 'sing' special *okinchalanina* or fur-string necklets, which they place round the man's neck, or they may simply charm a food such as a witchetty-grub or lizard and give this to the man to eat." To promote desire, a man will give a woman to eat a part of the reproductive organs of a male opossum or kangaroo. In the case of a delicate woman, a husband tries to strengthen her by "singing" over such parts of a male animal, which she then eats.[4] This instance shows the identity of such love-charms and the transmission of strength already described.

In the love-charms quoted, there are cases not only of *ngadhungi* but of transmission by ordinary contact. Leaving now this transmission of evil purpose and of love, we come to the general ideas of transmission of properties by ordinary contact. As one fears the malicious intention of an enemy which results in sickness or death by transmission of his malevolence, and welcomes or disdains, as the case may be, the feelings of love transmitted by material methods, so one fears or

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 358.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 370. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 262.

[4] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 548.

invites the involuntary transmission of another's qualities by contact. The lover is concerned with both sides of the taboo state in its beneficent aspect, he hopes to transmit his own love to his mistress, and to receive hers, by contact. But if, as is generally the case with uncivilised man, the imperious instinct of love is crossed or conditioned by presuppositions concerning female character derived from the experience of ordinary life, the caution which he shows with the animals in the satisfaction of love will be accentuated by somewhat of fear of the contagion of female properties in the closest sort of contact.[1] We shall see [2] that the male sex, with an unanimity which is practically universal, ascribe to the female a relative inferiority in physical strength. This is a physiological idea arising straight from a sexual secondary difference which is practically universal. If savage man then fears that in ordinary association with women he may be infected with their relative weakness, and if the more civilised fear the moral "infection" of effeminacy, it is quite natural that in the closest form of contact this fear should be accentuated.[3]

[M. Salomon Reinach, in discussing this view, and after

[1] [M. M. Knight, I. L. Peters *and* P. Blanchard, *Taboo and Genetics* (1921), p. 117, write of the present passage: ". . . he has gone so far as to express the opinion that the fear of effeminacy was probably the chief factor in the sex taboo. This is probably the weakest part in Mr Crawley's study . . ." But it will be observed that the actual words in the text are far more moderate than they are represented to be.]

[2] [Below, i. 244 *et seq.*]

[3] [Lord Avebury (Sir John Lubbock), *Marriage, Totemism and Religion* (1911), pp. 65-66, wrote: "Mr Crawley suggests that contact with women is likely to produce weakness and timidity. But of those living in close community, why should some have the injurious influence and not others?" This criticism is a little difficult to understand, but if it means, why should women have an injurious influence and not others, it is obvious that Lord Avebury wrote at second-hand without having even read the sentences immediately preceding the passage which he criticises.]

observing that the theory here expressed is childish and that "ceux qui se contenteront d'explications pareilles y mettront de la bonne volonté," proceeds as follows: "S'il y avait un atome de vérité dans la théorie de M. Crawley, les femmes devraient partout rechercher avec avidité le contact des hommes, a fin d'acquérir les qualités viriles qui leur manquent et dont l'absence constitute leur infériorité. Or, loin de là, les femmes craignent le contact des hommes plus que les hommes ne craignent le contact des femmes et leur pudeur est autrement exigeante que celle du sexe forte. Que reste-t-il donc de tout l'argumentation du savant anglais?" [1] This criticism, which is so triumphantly made, rests on a misunderstanding and on a false assumption. It is to misunderstand the theory here set out to suppose that because personal properties are believed to be transmissible by contagion, savage women should therefore seek out contact with men in order to acquire male characteristics. To assume this is to impose one's own mode of thought on a savage; and it is to overlook the countervailing influence of female sexual modesty, the indisputable existence of which is in itself proof, or so it is now generally supposed, of a subconscious fear of the male. The false assumption is that women fear men, in the sense in which that expression is used in the text, far more than men do women. There is no evidence to justify so dogmatic an assertion on this point. But even granting M. Reinach this point, what evidence is there that women do not in fact seek out the male? And it is further an arguable point that female sexual modesty, even if it is not an "invitation," as we have

[1] S. Reinach, in a review of the first edition of *The Mystic Rose* in *L'Anthropologie* (1902), xiii. 537; *id.*, *Cultes, Mythes et Religions* (1905-1912), i. 116.

seen [1] Dr Ellis to believe, does not belong to the lowest levels of the subconsciousness, and that an instinct for seeking out the male may be one still more profound. Finally, there are even special reasons, set out in the next sentences, which could justify an hypothetical assumption that males fear sexual intercourse more than females fear it.] [2]

The conception is also based on what is the complement of the idea of female weakness, namely, the practically universal physiological belief that sexual intercourse is weakening.[3] This is a conception that may be called instinctive, inasmuch as it arises straight from a peculiarity of the function. This peculiarity is the fact that sexual intercourse is followed by a temporary depression, resulting from increased blood-pressure. The idea, then, that contact with women entails weakness, thus arises in two ways which meet by a remarkable coincidence in the sexual act.

In further illustration we may note the idea, probably universal, and correlative with the above-mentioned physiological conception, that strength resides in the seminal fluid.[4] It is an interesting case of effect put for cause. In ordinary human thought the seed is the strength, as much as the blood is the life. The folk-medicine of most countries, especially in Europe, is full of cases where human semen is used to cure sickness. Primitive man, most practically, it is to be noted, correlates weakness and sickness; and there are also numerous examples of semen being administered in order to produce strength. The idea is then carried on to the

[1] Above, i. 218. [2] See also above, i. 218 *et seq.*

[3] [Cp. E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1921), i. 415.]

[4] [See above, i. 142.]

organs of generation, as has been already described. Zulus think the *testes* the seat of strength.[1]

Much indirect evidence from savage custom has already appeared[2] showing the universal belief that sexual intercourse is weakening, a belief based on this double idea. The Creek Indians believed that carnal connection with a woman exercised an enervating influence upon men and rendered them less fit for the duties of a warrior.[3] In Halmahera men must practice continence when at war, "otherwise they will lose their strength."[4] The explanation of this rule, which forbids to warriors, hunters [and others occupied in difficult, important or critical tasks] any sort of intercourse with women before and during their expeditions and the like, may now be completed. The main feature of such rules is the injunction of continence, and the idea which prompts this is that while contact with women transmits female weakness, the retention of a secretion, in which strength is supposed to reside, ensures vigour and strength. A Congo belief is here instructive; when the *Chitomé* goes out to make his judicial circuit, criers "proclaim a fast of continence, the penalty for breaking which is death. The belief is that by such continence they preserve the life of their common father."[5] Similarly in the Kei Islands not only may men before going to war have no intercourse with women, but those remaining

[1] J. Macdonald, "Manners, Customs, Superstitions, and Religions of South African Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1891), xx. 116.

[2] [Above, i. 65 *et seq.*]

[3] C. Swan, "Position and State of Manners and Arts in the Creek, or Muscogee Nation in 1791," *in* H. R. Schoolcraft, *Historical and Statistical Information* (1851-1860), v. 272.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 69.

[5] W. W. Reade, *Savage Africa* (1863), p. 362.

behind must practise the same continence.[1] Strict chastity is observed by the Malays in a stockade, else the bullets of the garrison will lose their power.[2] In Ceramlaut it is a sin not to cleanse the person after intercourse with a woman, when a man is about to go to war.[3] A parallel custom is that of Muslims, who, during the pilgrimage to Mecca which every good Muslim must perform once in his life, must abstain from all sexual intercourse.[4] In practice, doubtless an unmarried man may make a better soldier, precisely because there is no tie to render death more terrible.

Further, just as many detachable portions of the organism are regarded as parts of a man's soul, being filled with his life and character, and sometimes, for his safety, as external souls, so those secretions which have in fact the closest connection with life and strength might naturally be regarded in thought as having inherent in them a considerable part of the life and soul, or sometimes as being identical therewith. The widely spread belief that the blood is the life is well known ; it is also often regarded as containing the soul ; soul, life and strength are essentially identical in savage thought. We also find not only the universal idea that the seed is the strength, but, as might be expected, also cases where the soul is actually believed to be contained in the organs of procreation. Thus, in the islands Leti, Moa and Lakor, when a man is very ill, a ram is killed, and its genitals are given to the man to eat. The people believe that

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 223.

[2] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 524.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

[4] J. L. Burckhardt, *Travels in Arabia* (1829), i. 163.

the principle of life resides in those sexual parts.[1] Similarly, certain North American Indians believe that the father gives the child its soul, the mother its body only.[2] This is quite logical from the elementary notions of procreation. Now when we apply to these ideas the physiological fact that a temporary depression follows the sexual act, we may infer as probable a more or less constant physiological idea that in that act the man transmits some of his best strength, a part of his soul or life. We have had occasion to notice how primitive thought often anticipates modern scientific theory, and here is a conception on a par with other early conceptions, which anticipates somewhat the latest theories of the germ-plasm.

In the next place, there is the preliminary part of the function, the perforation of the *hymen*. Here we have an instructive instance of the diffidence, anxiety and caution with which the savage not only approaches things and acts unfamiliar or met with for the first time,[3] but makes preparation for the due and proper performance of important functions, not by way of improving upon nature, but of making sure of the working of nature's mechanism. Deferring for a moment the latter consideration, we can estimate here the female attitude. There is in the female sex an universal physiological anxiety concerning this act. Savages cannot feel so much pain or so much pleasure as men of a more complex and highly organised brain, but their precautions against, and fear of, pain are far more elaborate and

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 393.

[2] J. Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America* (1781), p. 378.

[3] [See above, i. 22 *et seq.*]

anxious. Like the higher animals, the savage is very diffident and timid by nature, except when a strong physical impulse is in full progress. Now we find that the savage uses more or less direct methods to avoid this preliminary act of handselling ; the avoidance is due to a vague religious fear based on the ideas of sexual taboo, also to the anxiety about a difficulty and, doubtless, to consideration for the female. Thus in the Dieri and neighbouring tribes it is the universal custom when a girl reaches puberty to rupture the *hymen*.[1] In the Portland and Glenelg tribes this is done to the bride by an old woman ; and sometimes white men are asked for this reason to deflower maidens.[2]

The artificial rupture of the *hymen* is a very widely spread custom. In this practice we see clearly the double idea of ridding the function of such difficulty as is associated by the savage with a spiritual material result, and of removing the first and therefore the most virulent part of female contagion as the West African "takes off the fetish" from a strange liquor by getting some one to handsel it.

Again, ignorance of the nature of female periodicity leads savage men to consider it as the flow of blood from a wound, naturally, or more usually supernaturally produced.[3] We must also bear in mind the connection often made between the menstrual flow and the blood shed at the perforation of the *hymen*. The two results appear so similar that man often infers more or less exact identity of cause.

[1] S. Gason, "The Tribes, Dieyerie, Auminie, Yandrawontha, Yarawuarka Pilladopa," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 169.

[2] R. B. Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria* (1878), ii. 319.

[3] [See above, i. 11-12, 16.]

The obvious inference was that the menstrual blood was caused by the bite of a supernatural animal or by congress with such or with a supernatural human agent or evil spirit.[1] The first of these is a fairly common idea. Certain Australian tribes believe that menstruation comes from dreaming that a bandicoot has scratched the parts.[2] Ploss and Bartels reproduce in illustrations wooden figures from New Guinea [and from New Britain in which these ideas have been put into artistic form. The one from New Britain (the original of which, in common with all the carvings here referred to, is in the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin), shows a bird apparently drawing something from the sexual parts of a woman.[3] A carving on a wooden plank from an unspecified part of New Guinea shows the jaws of a crocodile gripping the head of a woman, while a second crocodile, which is represented at full length, has the point of its snout in the woman's *vulva*.[4] A similar plank-carving represents a snake, evidently intended to resemble the male sexual organs, crawling out of a woman's *vulva*.][5] At the first menstruation of a Chiriguano girl old women run about the hut with sticks "striking at the snake which has wounded her."[6] In Portugal it is believed that during menstruation women are "liable to be bitten by lizards, and to guard against this risk they wear drawers during this period."[7] We may compare

[1] [Cp. E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1921), iii. 64.]

[2] "The Habits, etc., of the Aborigines in district of Powell's Creek, Northern Territory of South Australia," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 177.

[3] H. H. Ploss, *Das Weib in der Natur- und Volkerkunde* (1905), i. 481, figure 290.

[4] *Ibid.*, i. 482, figure 291.

[5] *Ibid.*, i. 483, figure 292. In the text (i. 486) this carving is incorrectly described as representing a male figure.

[6] *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses* (1780-1783), viii. 333.

[7] H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, ii. 237.

the prediction of the Fates in a modern Greek folk-tale that a princess was to be changed into a lizard in her fifteenth year if the sun should shine upon her.[1]

The connection of the serpent with sexual matters is very familiar [even in so vague a belief as, for instance, the Abyssinian one that] if the bride leaves her home in the interval between the betrothal and the marriage, she will be bitten by a snake.[2] This connection is found all over the world, and especially in European folklore. The explanation has been several times hinted at and is obvious when one considers the likeness in shape of the serpent, lizard, eel, and similar creatures, to the male organ of generation. Amongst the Malays to dream of being bitten by a snake portends success in love.[3] In Rabbinical tradition the serpent is the symbol of sexual desire.[4] It is worth noting that the curious phallic towers of Zimbabwe are surmounted by a bird's head.[5] And, as in primitive thought similar objects produce similar results, the dangerous effects of such supernatural organs is attributed to similar things, which may not therefore be touched or eaten by women at these dangerous times. Thus in New Guinea women are not allowed to eat eels, because a god once took the form of an eel to approach a woman while she was bathing.[6] Young women in the Halifax Bay tribe are forbidden to eat the flesh of male animals and eels.[7] Amongst the Central Australians boys and girls may not before puberty eat large lizards,

[1] Bernhard Schmidt, *Griechische Märchen, Sagen und Volkslieder* (1877), p. 98.

[2] M. Parkyns, *Life in Abyssinia* (1853), ii. 41.

[3] Sir W. C. Clifford, *In Court and Kampong* (1897), p. 189.

[4] H. H. Ellis, *loc cit.*

[5] J. T. Bent, "The Finds at the Great Zimbabwe Ruins," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 125.

[6] W. W. Gill, *Life in the Southern Isles* [1876], p. 279.

[7] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), ii. 425.

for if they do so they will acquire an abnormal craving for sexual intercourse.[1]

As to the second form of the belief, by the outward projection of the idea, the agent feared becomes an anthropomorphic spirit. Subconsciously the result is attributed to the male sex, but as the agent is invisible, the inference is naturally to a spiritualised man. Such is also the case with the widely spread belief in *incubi* and *succubi*, which is due to a similar inference from a common phenomenon of the early days of sexual life. The result is ascribed to a supernatural nocturnal visitor. Amongst the Yorubas erotic dreams are attributed to *Elegbra*, a god who, either as male or female, consorts sexually with men and women in their sleep.[2] In Siam evil spirits are believed to make the "wound" which causes the monthly flow of blood.[3]

In the particular question before us, we find a link between the serpent and a human agent in a common folk-tale motive. The tale in imitation of the Sanskrit from which we have already quoted,[4] tells us of a beautiful girl who killed a cobra to get the jewel from its head. To avenge this, the king of the snakes assumed the form of a handsome youth, and, after winning the girl's affections, married her. "At last the day came, and the nuptial ceremony was over, and the bridegroom went with his bride into the nuptial chamber. And he lifted her on to the marriage-bed, and called her by name. And as she turned towards him, he approached her

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 471-473.

[2] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), p. 67.

[3] S. de La Loubère, *Du royaume de Siam* (1691), i. 203.

[4] [Above, i. 42-43.]

slowly, with a smile on his face. And she looked and saw issuing from his mouth and disappearing alternately, a long tongue, thin, forked, and quivering like that of a snake. And in the morning the musicians played to waken the bride and bridegroom. But the day went on, and they never came forth. Then the merchant, her father, and his friends, after waiting a long time, became alarmed and went and broke the door, which was closed with a lock. And then they saw the bride lying dead on the bed, alone, and on her bosom were two small marks. And they saw no bridegroom. But a black cobra crept out of the bed, and disappeared through a hole in the wall."[1]

The idea is further extended. In the Aru Islands the women fear the evil spirit *Boitai*, when traversing the forest, because he takes the semblance of their husbands, and has intercourse with them there, shown afterwards by bleeding from the *vagina*.[2] So in Kola and Kobroor the women avoid going alone in the forest, so as not to be approached by *sisi*, evil spirits, the result of which is the growth of stones in the *uterus* and subsequent death.[3] In the Babar Islands there are evil spirits in the shape of men who approach young women, in the form of their husbands, and make them pregnant. These are identified with the well-known *suwanggi*, who are actual persons versed in sorcery.[4] In the islands of Wetar there is an evil spirit, named *Kluantelus*, who takes the form of a handsome man and has intercourse with women in the forest ; accordingly, women never go unaccompanied into the forest.[5] The natives of Amboina and Uliasser believe

[1] F. W. Bain, *A Digit of the Moon* (1901), pp. 93-95.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 252.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 271. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 340. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 439.

in evil spirits, male and female, who practise the following trick. When a man and a woman have made an assignation in the forest, one of these evil spirits is apt to take the shape and place of the man or woman, and whoever has intercourse with one of these dies in a few days. These people also believed that *Pontianak*, who in these islands is feared by women in child-birth, steals away infants and the genital organs of men.[1] The correlation of evil spirits with human beings is here well illustrated.

To these ideas is partly due the common estimate of women as a mysterious being who has communicated with a world of spirits. The other factor in the belief is the hysteria which is more or less frequent in the sexual life of women. Thus, in Buru hysterical prophetesses are believed to have had intercourse with evil spirits.[2] The idea further develops into the widely spread belief that women, especially about the time of puberty, have communication with gods, a belief emphasised by the common practice of secluding them at that time. This idea has been made much of by various systematised cults and has resulted in many phenomena of religious parthogenesis. In Cambodia it is sacrilege to abuse a young girl who is not of an age to marry. Such girls are called the wives of *Prah En* (*Indra*). During the seclusion called "the shade" which is necessary at puberty, young girls are called the wives of *Réa*, and it is a sin to abuse them. On leaving their retreat they become the wives of men.[3]

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), pp. 57-58.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[3] É. Aymonier, "Note sur les coutumes et croyances superstitieuses des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine française* (1883), vi. 192-193.

Another agent sometimes connected with these phenomena of periodicity is the sun. Sir James Frazer has given many examples of girls at puberty being forbidden to see the sun or fire, in connection with the idea that the sun can cause impregnation, as in the familiar story of Danaë. He also points out that boys at puberty, warriors and other taboo persons may not look upon the sun or fire.[1] Associated with the fear is the belief that the tabooed girl might pollute the sun, as Samoyed women can pollute the fire, that is, make it dangerous from taboo qualities to others. This is the objective aspect of taboo. From the subjective aspect, the point of view of the person in danger, there is the belief that impregnation can be effected by the sun. Early thought speculated deeply on the connection of the sun with the fertility and growth of vegetable and animal life. Not only the gentle rain from heaven, but also the kindly rays of the warm sun were credited, not unscientifically, with the power of impregnating Mother Earth and her offspring.[2] Inference from growth under the warm sun would naturally lead to the belief that women could thus be influenced by it. The moon also was sometimes credited with this power over women [as among the Greenlanders, who believe the moon to be male and to have the power of impregnating their women.][3] Here we come to the interesting question how far early man had observed the rhythmical connection of female periodicity with the moon. That monthly periodicity belongs

[1] Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), iii. 3 *et seq.*, x. 22 *et seq.*, 68. [See also A. E. Crawley, "Fire, Fire-Gods," *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (1913), vi. 26-30.]

[2] [Cp. Sir J. C. Frazer, *The Worship of Nature* (1926), i. 529 *et seq.*]

[3] G. M. Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life* (1868), p. 206; H. Egede, *A Description of Greenland* (1818), p. 209.

to women and moon alike could not fail to be marked, and there are indications that it was. Hence conceptions of an anthropomorphic kind concerning the connection of women with the moon. The "faithful witness in Heaven," by the way, is more often than not masculine in primitive thought.

In both of these correlative ideas, as also in the case of fire, often identified more or less with the sun, as the earthly phenomenon of the heavenly idea, we have now to consider whether they connect with any functional peculiarity of women, especially at puberty. In the case of mourners and the like, the potential danger of fire, as a beneficent but somewhat dangerous essence, not to be trifled with, is enough reason for the taboo, and applies also to girls and boys at the beginning of the sexual life. There is, however, a further coincidence arising, as so often, from a function. A peculiarity of puberty which passes on into the phenomena of love, is sudden accession of bodily heat, by which the whole frame from time to time feels filled with fire. It is in ideas arising from this functional phenomenon that we are to find the ultimate explanation of this fear of the sun. In all these taboos at puberty, it is the dangerous results of association with the other sex that are guarded against, and so characteristic a symptom as accession of heat could not fail to be noticed and avoided as far as possible. The "patient," using the primitive connotation of this term, must keep "cool." Parallel ideas from savage psychology bring this out. Anger, which is physiologically connected with an access of heat, is often attributed by savages to possession by an evil spirit,[1] as amongst the Battas.[2] More precisely there is

[1] [See above, i. 30.]

[2] F. Junghuhn, *Die Battaländer auf Sumatra* (1847), ii. 156.

an universal connection, seen in all languages, between love and heat. We saw[1] in a Greek folk-tale the connection between the sun at puberty and the lizard, a symbol of masculinity. A Central Australian myth of the origin of fire states that it came from the penis of an euro, which contained "very red fire."[2]

Again, and the idea is natural enough in tropical countries, there is a frequent connection between heat and evil spirits. To keep cool is one of the points of savage comfort in a hot climate, a wish which would naturally pass into the spiritual life. In Ceram[3] and Watubella,[4] a house which is filled with evil spirits is called a "warm" house. Health and soundness, on the other hand, are identified with coolness. For forty-four days after birth the Malay mother may not eat foods which have a heating effect on the blood, and the Malay infant is bathed with cold water every four hours "in order that it may be kept cool."[5] Especially fever is, of course, connected with heat. In the Wyingurri tribe of West Australia the sun is *Tchintu*. A stone of that name contains the heat of the sun, and is used to give a man fever by placing it where he will tread.[6] Here, as in so many cases before mentioned, there comes in the interesting question whether primitive man observes the connection of the temperature of the body with health and illness. As before, the case stands thus: man's unanalysed experience of temperature in sickness is included under an excessively wide generalisa-

[1] [Above, i. 232.]

[2] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, (1899), p. 446.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 141.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 210. [5] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 343.

[6] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *op. cit.*, p. 541.

tion, which has within it, though concealed in fallacy, a scientific truth, destined to emerge after a training in analysis and experiment.

This connection between illness, evil spirits and heat, is an adequate explanation of the rule whereby many persons in various kinds of danger may not see the sun or fire. Further, it is natural that on these ideas sexual intercourse should be especially forbidden at sexual crises, such as menstruation, pregnancy and for some time after child-birth. Woman's subconscious physical fear of man here correlates with an instinct of physiological thought caused by the discomfort of the function, and for the male sex, his fear of female contagion is intensified by the presence of female "disease." It is not long since the medical world gave up the primitive idea that menstrual blood is deleterious. In the present connection this hylo-idealistic "disease" is identical with the property of the sexual taboo state; on these occasions woman is more of a woman than in ordinary circumstances, and the danger of contagion is accordingly intensified.

Such are the dangers connected with the sexual act in the mind of primitive man, and to remove the material contagion there is used, with more than the mere idea of cleanliness, a religious purification. The bath taken by a Cadiack bridegroom and bride after the wedding night, "for the purification of himself and his partner,"[1] is one instance of an universal practice. The fear of transmission of female properties, here intensified, is also indirectly connected with female sexual secretions, such as menstrual blood, a special form of ceremonial "uncleanness." Moreover, when

[1] U. Lisiansky, *A Voyage Round the World* (1814), p. 199.

ideas of shame and disgust and, later, of religious purity, are brought in, the old undifferentiated spiritual-material secretions, as they may be called, which combined contagion of female weakness and imaginary disease and poison on the one hand, and on the other, of materialised physical fear of the male sex, in the *virus* which made contact dangerous, were split into specialised forms.

CHAPTER IX

SEXUAL RELATIONS (*Concluded*)

THESE ideas concerning contact regulate in social taboo human relations generally, and in sexual taboo those of men and women. The sexual properties whose transmission renders contact dangerous or beneficent may now be recapitulated, and further proof be given of their character and of the fact of their transmission. We have seen [1] that where sympathy, desire or love appears, contact between persons otherwise mutually dangerous becomes beneficent. Sympathy, aided by a common human impulse, which may be called allopathic, sometimes regards sexual difference as in itself efficacious to cure disease. For instance, the Australians employ the urine of the opposite sex as a cure for sickness.[2] In very serious cases blood from a woman's sexual organs is given to a man and his body rubbed with it, or blood from a man is given to a woman.[3] From a similar idea comes a custom found in the Aru Islands, where a battle can be instantly stopped if a woman throws her girdle between the armies.[4] But apart from cases like these and the methods of contact employed in love-charms and marriage

[1] [Above, i. 133 *et seq.*]

[2] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 300.

[3] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 464.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige russen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 261.

ceremonies, sexual contact is usually, on the principles of sexual taboo, regarded as deleterious. The Central Australians believe that to put a man's hair necklet or girdle near a woman would be productive of serious evil to her. They believe that sterility may be brought about by a girl in her youth playfully or thoughtlessly tying on a man's hair waist-band. The latter so used, if only for a moment or two, has the effect of cramping her internal organs and of making them incapable of the necessary expansion, and this is the most frequent explanation of sterility given by the natives.[1]

Owing to the monopoly of thought by the male sex it is rarely we hear of transmission of masculine properties to the female. It is more often a vague deleterious result that is thought of; for instance, Maori men may not eat with their wives, nor may male children eat with their mothers, "lest their *tapu* or 'sanctity,' should kill them."[2] This male taboo is, of course, male characteristics, such as relative superiority of strength. The Miris will not allow their women to eat tiger's flesh, "lest it should make them too strong-minded."[3] We have noticed[4] cases where men are not allowed to be present at lying-in, because their presence would hinder the birth. Another case is from Halmahera, where a pregnant woman is afraid to eat food left by her husband, for it would cause painful labour.[5] European folklore illustrates this masculine contagion, and the general idea that contact produces assimilation. In Hannover-Wendland and the Altmark if a boy and girl are baptised in the

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *op. cit.*, pp. 539, 52.

[2] R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui* (1870), p. 168.

[3] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (1872), p. 33.

[4] [Above, i. 72-73, 99.]

[5] J. G. F. Riedel, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 78.

same water, the boy becomes a woman-hunter, and the girl grows a beard. In Neumark if a girl is baptised in water used for a boy she will have a moustache. In Lower Saxony and Mecklenburg a boy must not be baptised in water which has been used for a girl, else he grows up beardless ; while a girl if baptised in water used for a boy becomes mischievous like boys. In Scotland if Jeanie is baptised before Sandie, she grows a beard and Sandie is beardless.[1] Hessian lads think they can escape conscription by carrying a baby-girl's cap in their pocket.[2]

Lastly, when females are of a masculine temperament [or when they have lost, in primitive thought, their feminity through widowhood or old age], they often assume male attire, an interesting practical method of assimilation. [Thus Sir Charles Brooke reports that the most influential and distinguished persons in the Dyak station of Lingga, about twenty miles from the mouth of the Batang Lupar and seventy from Sarawak,[3] were two old Malay ladies, who governed the place for many years. These ladies, when the locality was attacked, were seen on more than one occasion "dressed in men's clothes, with swords and spears in hand, commanding the people, and working as hard as any of them."[4] Lieutenant Somerville knew an old lady in Uripiv of the New Hebrides, "who was a person of great consideration, widow of a chief, who lived independently, covered with beads and armlets, and at the dances painted her face like a man and danced with the best of them."[5] Queen

[1] H. H. Ploss, *Das Kind in Brauch und Sitte der Völker* (1911-1912), i. 361 *et seq.*

[2] A. Wuttke, *Der deutsche Volksaberglaube der Gegenwart* (1900), p. 100.

[3] Sir C. A. J. Brooke, *Ten Years in Saráwak* (1866), i. 87.

[4] *Ibid.*, i. 130-131. Cp. P. J. Veth, *Borneo's Wester-Afdeeling* (1854-1856), ii. 355, and *loc. cit.*, note 3.

[5] B. T. Somerville, "Notes on some Islands of the New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* 1894), xxiii. 7.

Shinga of the Congo was wont to sacrifice, before she undertook any new enterprise, the handsomest man she could find. On the occasion of such a sacrifice she would dance and sing while clad in skins, with a sword hanging round her neck, an axe at her side and a bow and arrows in her hand.][1]

What, then, are the chief female properties the transmission of which is feared as deleterious? First of all, mere difference is regarded by the savage as dangerous, simply because it is unknown. In the second place, the difference is specialised as inferiority of physical strength and stature, relatively, that is, to the male standard. It is an universal conception amongst men of all stages of culture that woman is weaker than man. As a rule man forgets the relativity of this characteristic, and regards woman as more or less absolutely weak. [And it must not be forgotten that this belief is not universally true even in a relative sense; this is illustrated in a peculiarly interesting case reported by Sir Harry Johnston: "The A-ndombe seem to have satisfactorily solved the problem of the status of woman, to the woman's entire satisfaction. She is constituted carrier, labourer, and hard-worker in general, and this energetic life has so strengthened her muscular system that the women are in many cases stronger and finer than the men."[2] The same is doubtless true of other peoples amongst whom the same conditions prevail. However, that the belief in woman's weakness] is practically inherent in male human nature, as a physiological inference of the simplest kind is proved by its regular expression in the life and literature of all ages. The use and connotation of the word "effeminate"

[1] W. W. Reade, *Savage Africa* (1863), p. 364.

[2] Sir H. H. Johnston, "The Races of the Congo and the Portuguese Colonies in West Africa," *J.A.I.* (1884), xiii. 465.

illustrates this well. This evidence taken with that of ethnology is overwhelming. Primitive man agrees with the most modern of the moderns, for instance, with a Nietzsche, who regards woman as a slight, dainty and relatively feeble creature. The ethnological evidence for this masculine belief is very extensive.[1] General inferiority is sometimes found as a secondary result.

[1] See C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man* (1883), pp. 597, 117; H. H. Ellis, *Man and Woman* [1914], pp. 186 *et seq.*; A. Bastian, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (1860), iii. 292; E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), i. 629 *et seq.*; C. Letourneau, *La condition de la femme dans les diverses races et civilisations* (1903), *passim.*

J. Bonwick, *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians* (1870), p. 10; E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 207; J. Bonwick, "The Australian Natives," *J.A.I.* (1887), xvi. 205; C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals* (1889), pp. 100, 163; G. Taplin, "The Narrinyeri," in *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (1879), p. 11.

J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde* (1834-1835), i. 520; F. W. Beechey, *Narrative of a Voyage to the Pacific and Beering's Straits* (1831), i. 238, 241; C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans* (1875-1876), i. 67, 166, 177, 203, 231, ii. 45, 198, 219; J. Garnier, *Voyage autour du monde : Océanie* (1871), pp. 186, 350, 354; W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), iii. 199, 257, 293-294; C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition* (1845), iii. 332; T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 156, 169; J. W. Anderson, *Notes of Travel in Fiji and New Caledonia* (1880), pp. 218, 232; B. T. Somerville, "Notes on some Islands of the New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 7; R. Parkinson, *Im Bismarck-Archipel* (1887), pp. 98-99; R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (1891), p. 233; W. Powell, *Wanderings in a Wild Country* (1883), p. 54; C. B. H. von Rosenberg, *Der Malayische Archipel* (1878), pp. 454, 532; W. Marsden, *The History of Sumatra* (1811), p. 382; F. Junghuhn, *Die Battaländer auf Sumatra* (1847), ii. 81, 135, 339; P. A. Tiele, "De Europeërs in den Maleischen Archipel," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie* (1887), xxxvi. 305; Sir C. Brooke, *Ten Years in Saráwak* (1866), i. 101.

Sir R. Alcock, *The Capital of the Tycoon* (1863), i. 265; W. E. Griffis, *Corea* (1882), p. 245; E. R. Huc, *L'Empire Chinois* (1854), i. 268; J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *op. cit.*, i. 110; T. Shaw, "The Inhabitants of the Hills near Rájamahall," *Asiatick Researches* (1795), iv. 95; "Accounts of Independent Tatary," in J. Pinkerton, *A General Collection of Voyages and Travels* (1808-1814), ix. 379; J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie* (1776), pp. 14-15; Sir J. Chardin, "Travels . . . by way of the Black Sea," *in* J. Pinkerton, *op. cit.*, ix. 142.

E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*

In the savage mind the belief has been corroborated by the fallacies that woman's periodic loss of blood marks enfeeblement, an idea which often correlates with the notion that woman is a chronic invalid, sickness and weakness being identified—and that sexual intercourse is weakening.[1] In the next place is the relative timidity of woman, [a characteristic so generally recognised that it hardly requires illustration, but a few typical examples from savage life may be useful. Carl Lumholtz notes that the women among the Australian natives on the Herbert River were more timid than the men. When they caught sight of the white man, the men after a while

(1871), i. 152; J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), pp. 79-81; N. Isaacs, *Travels and Adventures in Eastern Africa* (1836), ii. 286; G. T. Mollien, *Voyage dans l'intérieur de l'Afrique* (1820), pp. 171-173; H. Hecquard, *Voyage sur la cote et dans l'intérieur de l'Afrique Occidentale* (1853), p. 324; D. Macdonald, *Africana* (1882), i. 35, 137, 141; C. New, *Life, Wanderings, etc., in Eastern Africa* (1874), p. 359; P. B. Du Chaillu, *Exploration and Adventures in Equatorial Africa* (1861), pp. 52, 377; Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), iii. 58; L. B. Proyart, *Histoire de Loango, Kakongo, et autres royaumes d'Afrique* (1776), p. 93; W. Bosman, *A New Description of the Coast of Guinea* (1705), p. 320; A. Bastian, *Ein Besuch in San Salvador* (1859), p. 71; Sir H. H. Johnston, "The Races of the Congo and the Portuguese Colonies in Western Africa," *J.A.I.* (1884), xiii. 465; C. R. Conder, "The Present Condition of the Native Tribes in Bechuanaland," *J.A.I.* (1887), xvi. 86; J. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 118-119; H. Ward, "Ethnographical Notes Relating to the Congo Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 289; C. J. Andersson, *Lake Ngami* (1856), p. 231; B. F. Leguével de Lacombe, *Voyage à Madagascar et aux Iles Comores* (1840), i. 108, 112.

H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America* (1875-1876), i. 511, iii. 494; Sir John Ross, *Narrative of a Second Voyage in Search of a North-West Passage* (1835), p. 578; J. B. Labat, *Nouveau voyage aux isles de l'Amérique* (1724), ii. 110; W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana* (1868), p. 353; M. Dobrizhoffer, *Historia de Abiponibus* (1784), ii. 155; P. Jones, *History of the Ojebway Indians* (1861), p. 60; P. F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire et description general de la Nouvelle France* (1744), vi. 44; S. Powers, *The Tribes of California* (1877), p. 20; G. M. Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life* (1868), p. 91; S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean* (1796), pp. 90, 310.

[1] [See above, i. 226-228.]

waded across the river to the place where the stranger stood, but the women "deemed it safest to cross the river higher up. . . ."[1] On landing at one of the small islands near the Sandwich Islands, von Kotzebue found that only the old men ventured to touch him; the men in vain tried to persuade their wives to do likewise.[2] Similarly in Santa Cruz the women were timid and one "slipped away timidly as I came near."[3] Of the girls of the Marquesas Islands Herman Melville writes that "as soon as they perceived us they fled with wild screams into the adjoining thickets, like so many startled fawns." The men, on the other hand, came running towards them.[4] D'Albertis made many observations of a similar nature in New Guinea, where he found the females so timid that when meeting the white men they fled so precipitately that they lost their solitary garment and their cooking pots,[5] or jumped out of a canoe into the water.[6] Apart from this special terror of the women, d'Albertis writes: "I neither saw nor heard any bird that interested me as we went along; but when, two or three times, I was on the point of firing my gun, my companions stopped me, crying 'Mia, mia! babini mariki' (No, no, the women are afraid). How many things have not the natives prevented my doing with these terrible words, 'The women are afraid!'"[7] The natives of Central Brazil say that

[1] C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals* (1889), p. 91.

[2] O. von Kotzebue, *A Voyage of Discovery into the South Sea and Beering's Straits* (1821), ii. 56.

[3] W. Coote, *Wanderings, South and East* (1882), p. 163.

[4] H. Melville, *Narrative of a four months' residence amongst the natives of a valley of the Marquesas Islands* (1846), p. 76.

[5] L. M. d'Albertis, *New Guinea* (1880), i. 14-15.

[6] *Ibid.*, i. 189-190.

[7] *Ibid.*, i. 292; cp. *ibid.*, i. 200, 318, 337, 342. See also J. Crisp, "An Account of the Inhabitants of the Poggy or Nassau Islands," *Asiatick Researches* (1799), vi. 82.

women are weak and must be protected, for she weeps at every danger.][1]

These characteristics of timidity and of weakness are the complements of masculine courage and strength and are connected with a physical subconscious fear of men. When associated with hysterical phenomena, timidity is merged in another conception of woman as a "mysterious" person. The mystery is based on sexual differentiation, and in particular on the sexual phenomena of menstruation and of child-birth. As we have seen,[2] this mystery is deepened by further ideas it creates, such as the ascription of taboo properties to woman, and the beliefs that woman has intercourse with the spiritual world at menstruation, and that she is more or less a potential witch. The whole reasoning is clinched by the fact of a temporary depression, identified with loss of strength, following upon intercourse with this weak but mysterious creature, and the imperious demands of nature which enforce association with the female sex, inevitably cause a continuous repetition of sexual taboo and of the ideas which underlie it. [Dr Marett, while agreeing that the savages themselves interpret sexual taboo as due to a fear of the transmission of properties, as due, in short, to a belief in the principles of sympathy, and that the evidence here brought forward on this point is conclusive,[3] proceeds to ask, "How, on the hypothesis that what is dreaded is simply the transmission of womanliness, are we to account for the fact—to quote the best-known

[1] K. von den Steinen, *Unter den naturvölkern Zentral-Braziliens* (1894), p. 332. Cp. S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort in Hudson's Bay to the Northern Ocean* (1795), p. 310.

[2] [Above, i. 231 *et seq.*]

[3] R. R. Marett, *The Threshold of Religion* (1914), p. 94.

story of the kind—that when an Australian black-fellow discovered his wife to have lain on his blanket he wholly succumbed to terror and was dead within a fortnight?[1] Only a twilight fear, a measureless horror, could thus kill."[2] To Dr Marett the explanation here put forward is no more than an *ex post facto* "justification of a mystic avoidance already in full swing."[3] There is much to be said for this argument, but I cannot agree that it is opposed to the theory expounded by Mr Crawley; for, even accepting the hypothesis that a general awe of the supernatural belongs to a deep level of consciousness, the evidence adduced throughout the present volumes, as Dr Marett himself appears to admit, shows that in savage man's fear of woman there is to be found not only a fear (or awe, if Dr Marett prefers this term) of the mysterious in her, but that to this element there is joined the fear of acquiring himself the weakness and deficiencies which he believes to characterise women. Thus, strictly, the only difference between the two views is that according to the one the more important factor is an awe of the supernatural or mysterious, and according to the other the preponderant element is a fear of the contagion of properties. As to which of these views is just it would be premature to pronounce.]

The organic characteristics which we have viewed not only make woman peculiarly susceptible to religious influences, but have fitted her to be a useful medium for priestcraft and often to hold the priestly authority herself. The priestess is a frequent feature

[1] [On p. 95 Dr Marett's notes 4 and 5 should be transposed, and the present reference corrected to W. E. Armit, "Customs of the Australian Aborigines," *J.A.I.* (1880), ix. 459. See also above, i. 176, 191.]

[2] R. R. Marett, *op. cit.*, p. 95. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 95 *n.*[2].

of savage worship. Here is to be found the explanation of one set of cases of priests dressing as women. For example, amongst the Sea Dyaks some of the priests pretend to be women, or rather dress as such, and like to be treated as females.[1] Patagonian sorcerers, who are chosen from children who have St Vitus's dance, wear women's clothes.[2] Amongst the Kodyaks, there are men dressed as women, who are regarded as sorcerers and are much respected.[3] [In short, as Sir James Frazer has admirably summarised the matter, there is "a custom widely spread among savages, in accordance with which some men dress as women and act as women throughout life. These unsexed creatures often, perhaps generally, profess the arts of sorcery and healing, they communicate with spirits, and are regarded sometimes with awe and sometimes with contempt, as beings of a higher or lower order than common folk. Often they are dedicated and trained to their vocation from childhood. Effeminate sorcerers or priests of this sort are found among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo, the Bugis of South Celebes, the Patagonians of South America, and the Aleutians and many Indian tribes of North America. In the island of Rambree, off the coast of Aracan, a set of vagabond 'conjurors,' who dressed and lived as women, used to dance round a tall pole, invoking the aid of their favourite idol on the occasion of any calamity. Male members of the Vallabha sect in India, often seek to win the favour of the god Krishna, whom they specially revere, by wearing their hair long and assimulating themselves to women; even their spiritual chiefs, the

[1] S. St John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East* (1862), i. 62.

[2] A. Bastian, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (1860), iii. 310.

[3] H. J. Holmberg, "Ethnographische Skizzen über Völker des russischen Amerika," *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae* (1856), iv. 120.

so-called Maharajas, sometimes simulate the appearance of women when they lead the worship of their followers. In Madagascar, we hear of effeminate men who wore female attire and acted as women, thinking thereby to do God service. In the kingdom of Congo, there was a sacrificial priest who commonly dressed as a woman, and glorified in the title of grandmother."][1] Doubtless the idea is to assume such emotional peculiarities as are useful to the priest. To the savage mind, the donning of another's dress is more than a token of the new position: it completes identity by communicating the qualities of the original owner. There is also the desire to command attention by eccentricity if not by mystery, for both of which ends change of sex is a time-honoured method.

It remains to add direct evidence for the belief, which is the chief factor in sexual taboo, that contact with women causes transmission of female characteristics, feminity, effeminacy, weakness and timidity. One of Hesiod's maxims is a prohibition against washing in water used by a woman.[2] In Homer, Odysseus fears lest he be "unmanned," and therefore susceptible to Circe's influence if he ascend her couch.[3] Herodotus[4] and Hippocrates,[5] describe a class of impotent men amongst the ancient Scythians who were made to do women's work and to associate with women alone.

The Higras of South India are natural eunuchs, or castrated in boyhood; they dress in women's clothes.[6] The Khyoungthas have a legend of a man who reduced

[1] Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), vi. 253 *et seq.*, which see for references to the authorities.

[2] Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 798.

[3] Homer, *Odyssey*, x. 301, 339-341.

[4] Herodotus, *History*, i. 105, iv. 67.

[5] Hippocrates, *Aphorismi*, i. 561.

[6] J. Shortt, "The Kajas of Southern India," *J.A.I.* (1873), ii. 406.

a king and his men to a condition of feebleness by persuading them to dress up as women and perform female duties. When they had thus been rendered effeminate, they were attacked and defeated without a blow. "That," say the Khyoungthas, "is why we are not so brave as formerly."[1] The advice given to Cyrus by Croesus was identical with that of the Hillmen, and the result was the same.[2] Amongst the Lhoosais, when a man is unable to do his work, whether through laziness, cowardice or bodily incapacity, he is dressed in women's clothes and has to associate and work with the women.[3] Impotent Koonkies in a similar manner dress as women.[4]

Among the Dyaks of North-West Borneo, young men are forbidden to eat venison, which is the peculiar food of women and old men, "because it would render them as timid as deer."[5] In Ceram, menstruous women may not approach the men, lest the latter should be wounded in battle.[6] The Galela and Tobelorese are continent during war, "so as not to lose their strength."[7] The Tsecats of Madagascar are impotents who dress as women.[8] In the Solomon Islands, a man will never pass under a tree fallen across the path, for fear a woman may have stepped over it.[9] In Central Australia, during his period of initiation, a medicine-man must sleep

[1] T. H. Lewin, *Wild Races of South-Eastern India* (1870), p. 136.

[2] Herodotus, *History*, i. 155-157.

[3] T. H. Lewin, *op. cit.*, p. 255. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

[5] S. St John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East* (1862), i. 186.

[6] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1885), p. 139.

[7] J. G. F. Riedel, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1885), xvii. 69.

[8] A. Bastian, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (1860), iii. 311.

[9] H. B. Guppy, *The Solomon Islands* (1887), p. 4.

with a fire between him and his wife, for "if he did not do this his power would disappear for ever."[1] In Western Victoria, a menstruous woman may not take any one's food or drink, and no one will touch food that she has handled, "because it will make them weak."[2] In the Booandik tribe, if men see women's blood they will not be able to fight.[3] In the Encounter Bay tribe, boys are told from infancy that if they see menstrual blood, their strength will fail them prematurely.[4] In the Wiraijuri tribe, boys are reproved for playing with girls: the culprit is taken aside by an old man, who solemnly extracts from his legs some "strands of the woman's apron" which have got in.[5] From such ideas as these is derived the custom of degrading the cowardly, infirm and conquered to the position of females. At the initiation of a Macquarrie boy, the men stand over him with waddies, threatening instant death if he complains while the tooth is being knocked out. He is afterwards scarified: if he shows any sign of pain, three long yells announce the fact to the camp; he is then considered unworthy to be admitted to the rank of man, and he is handed over to the women as a coward. Thenceforward he becomes the playmate and companion of children.[6]

In South Africa a man must not, when in bed,

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 529.

[2] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1881), p. cii.

[3] J. Smith, *The Booandik Tribe* (1880), p. 5.

[4] H. E. A. Meyer, "Manners and Customs of the Aborigines of the Encounter Bay Tribe," in *Native Tribes of South Australia* (1879), p. 186.

[5] A. W. Howitt, "Some Australian Ceremonies of Initiation," *J.A.I.* (1884), xiii. 448.

[6] C. F. Angas, *Savage Life and Scenes in Australia and New Zealand* (1830), ii. 224.

touch his wife with his right hand, for "if he did so, he would have no strength in war, and would surely be slain."[1] If a man touches a woman during her period of menstruation, "his bones became soft, and in future he cannot take part in warfare or any other manly exercise."[2] Stepping over another person is highly improper; while if a woman should step over her husband's stick "he cannot aim or hit anyone with it. If she steps over his *assegai*, it will never kill or even hit an enemy, and it is at once discarded and given to the boys to play and practise with."[3]

A Zulu, newly married, dares not go out to battle for fear he should be slain; should he nevertheless fight and fall, the men say "the lap of that woman is unlucky."[4] A Fan so weak that he could hardly move about was supposed to have become so by seeing the blood of a woman who had been killed. "The weak spirit of the woman had got into him."[5] Amongst the Damaras men may not see a lying-in woman, "else they will become weak and will be killed in battle."[6] Amongst the Barea, man and wife seldom share the same bed; the reason they give is, "that the breath of the wife weakens her husband."[7] Contempt for female timidity has caused a curious custom amongst the Gallas; they amputate the *mammæ* of boys soon after birth, believing that no warrior can possibly be brave who

[1] J. Macdonald, "Manners, Customs, Superstitions, and Religions of South African Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1891), xx. 140.

[2] *Ibid.*, xx. 119.

[3] *Ibid.*, xx. 130.

[4] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), pp. 441-443.

[5] M. H. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa* (1897), p. 447.

[6] E. Dannert, "Customs of the Ovaherero at the Birth of a Child," *Folk-Lore Journal* (Cape Town, 1880), ii. 63.

[7] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien* (1864), p. 526.

possesses them, and that they should belong to women only.[1]

In Cuba a man who becomes too old for his customary occupations, has to help the women and wears their dress.[2] In British Guiana cooking is the province of the women. On one occasion, when the men were compelled to bake some bread, they were only persuaded to do so with the utmost difficulty, and were ever after pointed at as old women.[3] North American Indians, both before and after war, refrain "on religious grounds" from women. Contact with females, some of them hold, "makes a warrior laughable, and injures his bravery for the future."[4] Amongst the Pomo Indians of California, when a man becomes too infirm for a warrior, he is made a menial and assists the squaws.[5] As we have already seen in one or two cases in the present connection, the association of lack of virility with the normal estimate of woman has led to the remarkable custom of degrading impotent men and others in a similar position to the level of women. A good example of this is furnished by the Yukis and other tribes of California, amongst whom are to be seen men dressed as women; these are called i-wa-musp, man-woman. They appear to be destitute of desire and virility; they perform all the duties of women and shirk all functions pertaining to men. Two reasons are given for the origin of this class of men:

[1] Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), iii. 58. The cauterisation of the *mammæ* by Amazons is to be compared.

[2] A. Bastian, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (1860), iii. 313.

[3] Sir E. F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana* (1883), p. 256.

[4] J. D. Hunter, *Memoirs of a Captivity among the Indians of North America* (1824), p. 299; C. Swan, "Position and State of Manners and Arts in the Creek, or Muscogee Nation in 1791," *in* H. R. Schoolcraft, *Historical and Statistical Information* (1851-1860), v. 269.

[5] S. Powers, *Tribes of California* (1877), p. 160.

masturbation, and a wish to escape the responsibilities of manhood. There is a ceremony to initiate such men to their chosen life; the candidate is placed in a circle of fire, and a bow and "woman-stick" are offered to him, with a formal injunction to choose one or the other, and to abide by his choice for ever.[1] The Seminoles believed that "carnal connection with a woman exercised an enervating influence upon men, and rendered them less fit for the duties of the warrior."[2] Amongst the Omahas, if a boy plays with girls he is contemptuously dubbed "hermaphrodite."[3] When the Delawares were denationalised by the Iroquois and prohibited from going out to war, they were, according to the Indian notion, "made women," and were henceforth to confine themselves to the pursuits appropriate to women.[4] In Greenland, as elsewhere, old men dressed as women and did the appropriate work.[5]

[That these conceptions are still alive in Europe is shown by many items of folklore, of which the two following are typical.] In Brandenburg the peasants say that a baby boy must not be wrapped in an apron, else it will, when grown up, run after the girls. In Mecklenburg, a new-born girl must be first kissed by the mother and a boy by the father, else the girl will grow whiskers and the boy's face be hairless.[6]

With regard to the particular circumstances of menstruation and child-birth, the obvious vehicle of

[1] S. Powers, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-133. Cp. W. C. van Eschwege, *Journal von Brasilien* (1818), ii. 276.

[2] C. Swan, *op. cit.*, v. 272.

[3] J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1884 for 1881-1883), iii. 266.

[4] L. M. Morgan, *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nec, or Iroquois* (1851), p. 16.

[5] A. Bastian, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (1860), iii. 314.

[6] H. H. Ploss, *Das Kind in Brauch und Sitte der Völker* (1911-1912), i. 361 *et seq.*

contagion is blood. But it is not fear of woman's blood which is the primary cause of avoidance ; this would not account, except by the most strained analogy, for most of the facts ; nor is there any flux of blood during pregnancy, when woman is regularly taboo ; woman's hair, nail-pairings and occupations can hardly be avoided from a fear of woman's blood ; and there is also the female side of the question to be taken into account. It is necessary to note this, because an attempt has been made to build up for savage thought a shrine of mystery round woman, cemented with blood, and that not her own, but ordinary human blood.[1] The savage indeed regards blood, as he does flesh and other human substance, as containing the life, but sentimental ideas of the sacredness of blood in itself, as apart from its containing human or sexual properties, are not to be found in early thought ; nor in early thought are there any such strong notions of the blood-tie of kindred as is generally

[1] As by E. Durkheim, "La prohibition de l'inceste et ses origines," *L'année sociologique* (1898), i. 1-70. [M. Reinach complains rather strangely in his review of the first edition of *The Mystic Rose* in *L'anthropologie* (1902), xiii. 536-537, that Mr Crawley did not take M. Durkheim's theory into sufficient account, and that he either misunderstood it or that his reference to it was made at second-hand, a complaint that M. Durkheim himself does not make. (For M. Reinach's reference at *loc. cit.*, xiii. 537 *n.*, to p. 42 of *The Mystic Rose*, read p. 212.) But Mr Crawley's criticism is certainly cogent and appears to be unanswerable ; it has been accepted by Dr Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), i. 664 *n.*[1] M. Durkheim, in answering Mr Crawley's criticisms of his view (in a review of *The Mystic Rose* in *L'année sociologique* (19 3), vi. 355), suggests that the cases noted above in which blood is used to give strength and courage are due to a belief in its sacredness and not to the belief described in the text. This may reasonably be allowed as a moot point not at present susceptible of definitive solution. But the main criticism that blood cannot be connected with some of the most general taboos, such as that of a pregnant woman, M. Durkheim entirely ignores, contenting himself with a restatement of his trilogy of "manifestations sanglantes," puberty, menstruation, and lying-in. For this subject in general, see H L. Strack, *Der Blutaberglaube in der Menschheit* (1892), and H. C. Trumbull, *The Blood Covenant* (1893).]

supposed. Blood is only one of many vehicles by which contact influences relation. Blood is freely used by savages to assuage thirst, as well as to produce strength. The prohibition against letting it fall on the ground has led to an erroneous idea of its "sacredness," and in most cases may be more simply explained. To savages who do not know the use of salt, blood is an excellent substitute. In the Central Australian tribes "blood may be given by young men to old men of any degree of relationship, and at any time, with a view to strengthening the latter."[1] Again, blood is not infrequently used, as has been observed, to assuage thirst and hunger; indeed, when under ordinary circumstances a black-fellow is badly in want of water, what he does is to open a vein in his arm and drink the blood.[2] Other Australian tribes "have no fear of blood or the sight of it"; they drink it freely to acquire strength.[3] The Wachago[4] and Koos[5] delight in drinking warm blood fresh from a slaughtered animal. At the Dieri ceremony of *Wilyaru* blood drawn from men is poured on the novice's back "to infuse courage, and to show him that the sight of blood is nothing."[6] The latter reason is secondary. Woman's blood is feared or desired, just as are other parts of woman, because it is a part of woman and contains feminine properties.

The contagion of woman during the sexual crises of

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 461.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 462.

[3] S. Gason, "The Tribes, Dieyerie, Auminie, Yandrawontha, Yarawuarka, Pilladopa," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 172.

[4] W. H. Flower, "Description of Two Skeletons of Akkas," *J.A.I.* (1889), xviii. 13.

[5] H. B. Rowney, *The Wild Tribes of India* (1882), p. 31.

[6] A. W. Howitt, "The Dieri and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia." *J.A.I.* (1891), xx. 82.

menstruation, pregnancy, child-birth, is simply intensified, because these are occasions when woman's peculiar characteristics are accentuated : these are feminine crises when a woman is most a woman. This is the only difference between contact then and contact in ordinary states, a difference of degree only.

We may now conclude the description of the ideas which have produced sexual taboo. We have traced its origin from sexual differentiation, difference of occupation, and a resulting solidarity in each sex ; this biological material is then informed by religious ideas concerning human relations, which are regulated by contact. Thus the usual working motive in sexual taboo is that the properties of the one sex can be transmitted to the other by all methods of contact, transmission or contagion, and by various vehicles.[1] Animal-like the savage fears weakness more than anything else. Two remarkable facts have emerged : first, that it is dangerous, and later, wrong, for men to have anything to do with women ; intercourse commensal and sexual being especially dangerous because especially intimate, but there is a tendency against all living together ; and secondly, that sexual intercourse, even when lawful morally and legally, is dangerous first, and later, sinful.[2] To primitive thought

[1] [It is to be noted how closely these suggestions have been followed by the American anthropologists of the functional psychology school ; see, for instance, Hutton Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies* (1908), p. 1 : "Sexual solidarity itself is only another expression for the working of that universal law of human sympathy, or in a more modern phrase, of consciousness of kind, which lies at the foundations of all social relations. But in primitive societies, to these forces bringing about sexual separation, there is added a force even more potent, which originates in widespread beliefs as to the transmissibility of sexual characteristics from one individual to another."]

[2] [Cp. E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), i. 664.]

all intercourse has one connotation of material danger, which later split into ideas of sins, such as incest or fornication, for any intercourse is the breaking of a personal taboo and a sexual taboo, and the material results of such breaking develop into moral sin.

Sexual taboo would seem to have had the useful results not only of assisting Nature's institution of the family and of producing the marriage system,[1] by preventing licence both within and without the family limits, keeping men from promiscuity and incest, degradations which were never primitive—the early efforts of human religious thought being in the direction of assisting, not of checking Nature—but also of emphasising the characteristic qualities of each sex by preventing a mixture of male and female temperaments through mutual influence and association, and, as the complement to this, of accentuating by segregation the charm each sex has for the other in love and married life, the charm of complementary difference of character. Man prefers womanliness in woman, and woman prefers manliness in man ; sexual taboo has enhanced this natural preference.

Where sexual taboo is fully developed, the life of husband and wife is a sort of divorce *a mensa et thoro*, and the life of men and women is that of two divided castes. The segregation is naturally emphasised as between young persons of the opposite sex, most of all between those who, as living in the somewhat close contact of the family, are more strictly separated, both because parents prevent the dangerous results obviated by sexual taboo with all the more care since their own children are in danger, and because, subsequently, a feeling of duty in this regard is combined with the natural affection of

[1] [This thesis has been developed by Sir J. G. Frazer, *Psyche's Task* (1913).]

brothers and sisters, which is due to early association. The biological basis of this separation is the universal practice by which boys go about with the father as soon as they are old enough, and the girls remain with the mother. This is the preparatory education of the savage child, beginning about the age of seven. Girls and boys till the age of seven or eight, and sometimes till puberty, are often classed as "children," with no distinction of sex, as amongst the Kurnai.[1] In Leti, Moa and Lakor children are brought up together till about ten years old. The girls then begin to help the mother, and the boys go about with the father.[2] So in the Babar Islands.[3] Amongst the Kaffirs, as amongst most peoples, boys and girls till seven or eight live with the mother. As soon as they are old enough, the boys are taken under the father's charge.[4] In Samoa the boys leave their mother's care at seven years of age, and come under the superintendence of their father and male relatives. They are now circumcised and receive a new name.[5] This case combines an initiation ceremony placed at a date earlier than usual. In Patagonia the sons begin to go about with the father at ten, and the girls with the mother at nine.[6] Amongst the Jaggas, boys have to live together as soon as they can do without a mother's care.[7] Of some Australian tribes Mr Curr reports that "from a very early age the boys begin to imitate their fathers, and

[1] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), p. 189.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 392.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 355.

[4] H. Lichtenstein, *Travels in South Africa* (1812-1815), i. 260.

[5] J. S. Kubary, "Aus dem samoanischen Familienleben," *Globus* (1885), xlvii. 71.

[6] G. C. Musters, *At Home with the Patagonians* (1873), p. 177.

[7] J. L Krapf, *Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours during an Eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa* (1860), p. 243.

the girls their mothers, in their everyday occupations. When the boy is four or five years of age the father will make him a miniature shield, spear, and *wommera*, with which the little fellow fights his compeers and annoys his mother and the dogs. About seven or eight years of age commences in earnest the course of education. At eight or ten the boy has to leave the hut of his father and sleep in one common to the young men and boys of the tribe." [1]

The following cases show how sexual taboo emphasises this. In the Society and Sandwich Islands as soon as a boy was able to eat his food was kept distinct from that of his mother, and brothers and sisters were not allowed to eat together from the earliest age.[2] In Uripiv boys from a few days after birth are supposed to eat with the male sex only, else "death would mysteriously fall upon them. The fact of suckling, however, is overlooked." [3] In Fiji brothers and sisters may not speak to each other, nor eat together. The boys sleep in a separate room.[4] The relationship between brothers is termed *ngane*, which means "one who shuns the other." [5] In Melanesia there is a remarkable avoidance between a boy and his sisters and mother, beginning when he is first clothed, and in the case of his sister when she is first tatooed. He is also forbidden to go underneath the women's bed-place, just as a Melanesian chief thinks it a degradation to go where women may be above his head.[6] In New Caledonia brothers and sisters after having reached years of maturity

[1] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), i. 71.

[2] W. Ellis, *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii* (1826), p. 368; *id.*, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), i. 263; J. Cook, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean* (1784), ii. 156.

[3] B. T. Somerville, "Notes on some Islands of the New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 4.

[4] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 136.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 167. Cp. W. Coote, *Wanderings, South and East* (1882), p. 138.

[6] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (1891), pp. 232-233.

are no longer permitted to entertain any social intercourse with each other; they are prohibited from keeping each other's company, even in the presence of a third person, and if they casually meet, they must instantly go out of the way, or, if that is impossible, the sister must throw herself on the ground with her face downwards. Yet, if a misfortune should befall one of them, they assist each other to the best of their ability through the medium of a common friend.[1] In the Hervey Islands the first-born son is forbidden to kiss his sister; "she may not cross his path when the wind which has passed over her is likely to touch his most sacred person."[2] In Tonga a chief pays the greatest respect to his eldest sister, and may never enter her house.[3] [Dr Malinowski writes that avoidance between brother and sister "rooted in apprehension of mutual danger . . . is corroborated by the scanty Australian evidence that we possess."][4]

In Ceylon a father is forbidden to see his daughter at all after she has arrived at puberty, so also in the case of mother and son.[5] A Korean girl is taught that the most disgraceful thing a woman can do is to allow herself to be seen or spoken to by any man outside her own family circle. After the age of eight she is never allowed to enter the men's quarters of her own home. "The boys in the same way are told that it is unbecoming and undignified to enter the portion of the house set apart for females. The men and women have their meals separately, the women waiting on their husbands. Thus

[1] V. de Rochas, *La Nouvelle Calédonie et ses habitants* (1862), p. 239.

[2] W. W. Gill, *Life in the Southern Isles* [1876], pp. 46-47, 49.

[3] W. Mariner, *An Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands* (1817), ii. 156.

[4] B. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines* (1913), p. 309.

[5] "The Weddos," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London* (1865), n.s., iii. 71.

family life as we have it is utterly unknown in Corea." [1] In Japan young princes are prohibited from all intercourse with the opposite sex.[2] According to the moral code of the same country, "parents must teach their daughters to keep separate from the other sex. The old custom is: man and woman shall not sit on the same mat, nor put their clothing in the same place, shall have different bathrooms, shall not give or take anything directly from hand to hand. On walking out, even in the case of families, the men must keep separate from their female relatives." [3] Amongst the Nairs of Malabar a man honours his eldest sister; he may never stay in the same room with his other sisters, and his behaviour to them is most reserved.[4] In the Nanbúri caste of Travancore "women are guarded with more than Moslem jealousy; even brothers and sisters are separated at an early age." [5] Amongst the Todas near relations of different sexes consider it a "pollution" if even their garments should touch, and a case is mentioned of a girl expressing horror when handled by her father.[6] Amongst all the Indian tribes of California, brothers and sisters scrupulously avoid living together.[7]

With the approach of puberty, the sexual question appears, which emphasises the separation, both natural and taboo, and at the ceremonies of initiation boys are formally taken away from the mother's sphere and female

[1] W. E. Griffis, *Corea* (1882), p. 244; H. B. Saunderson, "Notes on Corea and its People," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 305-306.

[2] P. F. von Siebold, *Manners and Customs of the Japanese* (1841), p. 208.

[3] I. L. Bird, *Unbeaten Tracks in Japan* (1880), i. 323.

[4] A Giraud-Teulon, *Les origines de la famille* (1874), p. 153.

[5] S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore* (1883), p. 144.

[6] H. Harkness, *A Description of a Singular Aboriginal Race inhabiting the Neilgherry Hills* (1832), p. 72.

[7] S. Powers, *Tribes of California* (1877), p. 412.

associations. The danger, now enhanced by a new instinct, produces the very common custom that from this time boys may not sleep even in the house or with the family. A common form of this custom is the institution of public buildings, which combine the features of a dormitory and a club, for the use of the young men. [Thus, in Assam there are "barracks for the unmarried young men, and occasionally also for the girls. . . ." [1] Among the Dravidian Uraons the young men live in a hall in the middle village.[2] The young and unmarried men of the Hill Dyaks, after they have attained puberty, are not allowed to sleep in the houses of their parents, but occupy a special house which is set apart for that purpose.[3] In Mauat there are, in addition to the ordinary houses, two special ones, set apart for the boys and girls respectively.[4] In Buru the young men and girls have, similarly, separate sleeping-places.[5] The same is found in the Aru Islands,[6] Tenimber,[7] and Wetar.[8] Among the Niam-Niam special huts are set apart as sleeping-places for the boys, "as soon as they are of an age to be separated from the adults." [9] Finally, among the Kaffirs of Natal, not to multiply examples, as could easily be done, special huts are occupied by each wife, by married sons, and by unmarried men.] [10]

[1] S. E. Peal, "The *Morong*, as possibly a Relic of Pre-Marriage Communism," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 248-249.

[2] V. Ball, *Jungle Life in India* (1880), p. 646; E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (1872), pp. 248, 272.

[3] H. Low, *Sarawak* (1848), p. 247.

[4] W. W. Gill, *Life in the Southern Isles* [1876], p. 240.

[5] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 12.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 250. [7] *Ibid.*, p. 287. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 443.

[9] G. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa* (1873), i. 303, ii. 21.

[10] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), p. 15.

The separation of the young outside the family is a fairly regular social rule. Amongst the Greenlanders single persons of the opposite sexes seldom have any connection with each other; for instance, a maid would take it as an affront were a young fellow to offer her a pinch of snuff in company.[1] Among the Iroquois young men could have no intercourse with girls, nor even conversation;[2] and amongst most North American tribes "the chastity of girls is carefully guarded."[3] According to another authority "the separation of the immature youth of the two sexes is a feature strongly insisted upon in the social practice of all the North-West American tribes."[4] An earlier writer describes this separation in more detail; according to him the Northern Indian girls "are from the early age of eight or nine years prohibited by custom from joining in the most innocent amusements with children of the opposite sex. When sitting in their tents, or even when travelling, they are watched and guarded with such an unremitting attention as cannot be exceeded by the most rigid discipline of an English boarding school."[5] Amongst the Omahas a girl may not speak to a man, except those who are very near relations.[6]

[1] D. Cranz, *The History of Greenland* (1820), i. 145.

[2] L. H. Morgan, *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois* (1851), pp. 320, 323.

[3] S. de Champlain, *Les voyages de la Nouvelle France* (1632), i. 294; J. de Laet, *Novus orbis seu descriptionis Indiae Occidentalis* (1633), ii. 11; — Bossu, *Nouveaux voyages aux Indes Occidentales* (1768), ii. 18; J. Lawson, *The History of Carolina* (1714), pp. 34, 187.

[4] W. H. Dall, "Masks, Labrets, and Certain Aboriginal Customs," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1884 for 1881-1882), iii. 81.

[5] S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort in Hudson's Bay to the Northern Ocean* (1795), p. 311.

[6] J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1884 for 1881-1882), iii. 270.

In Loango a youth dare not speak to a girl except in her mother's presence.[1] In Madagascar the tribes of the forest and East Coast have a higher morality than the Hovas, girls being scrupulously kept from any intercourse with the male sex until marriage.[2] In Afghanistan, Eusofzye women consider it indecent to associate with the men.[3] Amongst the Leh-tas of Burma boys and girls [live in separate houses, and] "when they may have occasion to pass each other, avert their gaze, so that they may not see each other's faces."[4] In Cambodia the girls are carefully secluded, and the reserve which they show is remarkable. "The stringency of custom prevents the intercourse of the young. Accordingly the *rôle* of village Don Juan is scarcely possible."[5] [Santal youths and girls may look at each other, but this licence is not extended to speech; even if the young man's intentions are so honourable as to be directed towards marriage, should he speak to a girl he will be fined.][6] In the Andaman Islands bachelors may only eat with men, spinsters with women.[7] In the Tenimber Islands (Timorlaut), it is taboo for a boy to touch a girl's breast or hand, and for her to touch his hair.[8] In South Nias both the seducer and the victim are put to death.[9]

[1] L. B. Proyart, *Histoire de Loango, Kakongo, et autres royaumes d'Afrique* (1776), p. 40.

[2] J. Sibree, "Relationships and the Names used for them among the Peoples of Madagascar," *J.A.I.* (1880), ix. 43.

[3] M. Elphinstone, *An Account of the Kingdom of Kaubul* (1839), i. 241, 243, 313.

[4] A. Fytch, *Burma Past and Present* (1878), i. 343.

[5] É. Aymonier, "Note sur les coutumes et croyances superstitienses des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine francaise* (1883), vi. 191, 198.

[6] L. Hertel, *Indisk Hjemmemission blandt Santalerne* (1877), p. 83.

[7] E. H. Man, "The Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands," *J.A.I.* (1883), xii. 344.

[8] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 300.

[9] C. B. H. von Rosenberg, *Der Malayische Archipel* (1878), p. 167.

Amongst the Hill Dyaks the younger men are carefully separated from the girls.[1] [In Lifu, one of the Loyalty Islands, "a young man meeting or walking alone with and speaking to an unmarried or espoused girl might be killed by her father or other guardian."][2]

In New South Wales unmarried youths and girls may not speak to each other.[3] In some Victorian tribes the unmarried adults of both sexes are kept carefully apart.[4] Amongst the same people the seducer of an unmarried girl is beaten to death, and the girl is punished and sometimes killed.[5] [The same applies to many other peoples, amongst a large proportion of which, as Dr Westermarck has established,[6] pre-nuptial unchastity is either non-existent or punished.] On Fraser's Island "a young man will not sit down on the same stool or box, or in fact anywhere where a young woman has been sitting at any time. They imagine that the young man would sicken and die. The shadow of young women must not pass over the sleeping-places of young men."[7] In Tasmania "the young men and lads moved early from the camp in the morning so as not to interfere with female movements at rising. Unmarried men never wandered in the bush with women; if meeting a party of the other sex, native politeness required that they turned and went the other way."[8]

An Australian woman, in most tribes, is not allowed to converse or have any relations with any adult male,

[1] H. Low, *Sarawak* (1848), pp. 247, 300.

[2] S. H. Ray, "The People and Language of Lifu, Loyalty Islands," *J.A.I.* (1917), xlvii. 280.

[3] M. Davis, *in* R. B. Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria* (1878), ii. 318.

[4] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1881), p. ci. [5] *Ibid., loc. cit.*

[6] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1921), i. 138 *et seq.*

[7] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), iii. 145.

[8] J. Bonwick, *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians* (1870), p. 11.

save her husband. Even with a grown-up brother, she is almost forbidden to exchange a word.[1] Here the proprietary jealousy of husbands is a factor in the rule; but the common Australian custom, as in the Central tribes, where no man as a general rule may go near the *Erlukwirra*, or women's camp,[2] and no woman may approach the *Ungunja*, or men's camp,[3] brings us back to sexual taboo, and reminds us that this separation of the young is due to all the ideas of this taboo, and not to fear of sexual intercourse only. Such rules as usual become further causes, and have perpetuated the separation of the sexes.[4]

In the examples of separation of brother and sister, we have been really reviewing the process of preventing incest, and in those of the separation of young persons generally, the process of preventing "promiscuity."[5] Neither of these needed prevention, for neither was ever anything but the rarest exception in any stage of human culture, even the earliest; the former is prevented by the psychological difficulty with which love comes into

[1] E. M. Curr, *op. cit.*, i. 109.

[2] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 178.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 467.

[4] [Cp. A. Lang, *Social Origins* (1903), pp. 26, 32; N. W. Thomas, "The Origin of Exogamy," in *Anthropological Essays presented to Edward Burnett Tylor* (1907), pp. 344-345.]

[5] [Dr Rivers in his review of the first edition of *The Mystic Rose* in *Man* (1902), ii. 79, objected that Mr Crawley "lays great stress on the custom (which is very rare) of separation of brother and sister, and passes over very lightly the custom (which is very common) of sexual laxity before marriage, a custom which affords one of the most obvious arguments against the author's views." But both these assertions are inaccurate, for, as the above evidence, which makes no pretensions to completeness, amply shows, it is hardly accurate to describe the separation of brothers and sisters at and before puberty as "very rare"; and it is equally little accurate to call sexual laxity before marriage "very common," as is obvious enough from the evidence presented by Dr Westermarck even in the first edition of *The History of Human Marriage* (1891), pp. 61 *et seq.*; cp. the fifth edition (1921), i. 138 *et seq.*]

play between persons either closely associated or strictly separated before the age of puberty, a difficulty enhanced by the ideas of sexual taboo, which are intensified in the closeness of the family circle, where practical as well as religious considerations cause parents to prevent any dangerous connection. We saw[1] that in many cases, not merely is the intercourse of husband and wife not practised in the house, but even the performance of ordinary functions, such as eating, is prohibited there, as in New Zealand, and the Sandwich Islands. Parents bring up their children by the same rule, which is, put briefly, that all close connection between the sexes is dangerous, and especially between those who are in close contact. Marriage of man and woman is theoretically a forbidden thing, both outside and inside the family circle. The very word "incest" originally meant "unchaste,"[2] connoting a merely general infringement of sexual taboo, such infringement being the more reprehensible between those who are not likely to make it. As to the fictions of primitive incest and promiscuity, both in popular tradition and scientific theories of primitive marriage, it is natural that marriage systems should be explained as intended to put a stop to a prevailing practice, by those who do not know how religion simply assists nature, but the explanation does not at all go to show that these practices ever existed.

Lastly, as will be discussed hereafter,[3] it is the application of sexual taboo to brothers and sisters, who, because they are of opposite sexes, of the same generation, and are in close contact, and for no other reasons, are regarded as potientially marriageable, that is the foundation of exogamy and of the marriage system.

[1] [Above, i. 44 *et seq.*]

[2] [See *A New English Dictionary* (1901), *s.v.*, V. ii. 149.]

[3] [Below, ii. 244, 244 *n.* 5.]

THE TABOO REMOVED

CHAPTER X

THE BREAKING OF TABOO

We have seen the complication of the eternal drama of sex, and now approach the *dénoûment* as expressed in certain features of the ceremonies at puberty, and generally in love-practices and marriage ritual. The taboo is now to be broken.

The general removal of taboo takes many forms, some of which we have observed in passing. In all these forms alike the idea is to get rid of the material taboo substance, the "sacredness" or "uncleanness" with which the body has been, as it were, permeated and infected from contact of some sort with danger, religiously conceived, coming from spiritual or human agents, and in human relations, especially from human agents sometimes spiritualised, sometimes conceived of abstractly, or embodied in concrete persons. As the dangers are, whether spiritual or material, conceived of materially, so the methods used to obviate or remove them are such as would be used in dealing with matter.

First, we may briefly refer to some of the commonest means of avoiding the dangers of taboo, used before these dangers have descended and in expectation of them. Persons in this state of expectation are already taboo, as we have seen, but no confusion need attach to the

double meaning. Again, when a person is guarding himself against these dangers, their presence, potential or actual, causes other persons to avoid him, for fear of coming in for the same. So much being premised, we may instance the method of hiding from danger; thus sick people are frequently hidden so as to escape, if possible, from the evil influence.[1] People often change their house to avoid evil,[2] and it is a common practice after a death to burn the house down, or desert it.[3] When a man is sick the Aru islanders fire off guns round the house to drive away the evil spirits. If this fails they take the sick man to another house, in the hope that this will deceive the spirits.[4] The Ceramese, in the same way, take a sick man to another house to deceive evil spirits.[5] The Watubella natives remove a sick man from his house, "because it is a 'warm' house, or, in order to deceive the evil spirits."[6] The latter is the object of this practice in the Kei Islands.[7]

Various forms of seclusion carry out the same idea. Taboo persons dwell in special huts, so as to protect themselves and to isolate themselves, [as we have already seen[8] in connection with menstruation taboos and the like]. A garb of woe is both appropriate to the feelings of the fearful soul and diverts the attention of evil. A sick Basuto sits under a rock, where, clothed with

[1] A. Bastian, *Allerlei aus Volks- und Menschenkunde* (1888), i. 437.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), pp. 265, 266, 267.

[3] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), p. 160; J. B. von Spix *and* C. F. P. von Martius, *Travels in Brazil* (1824), ii. 251.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 210.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 238.

[8] [Above, i. 76-77, 148, 200.]

miserable rags, he eats the coarsest food; he never washes; and continually curses the person who has bewitched him.[1] A good instance of dressing in rags for the practical purpose of exciting pity in human hearts is the custom as used by defendants in the law-courts of ancient Rome.

Evil is again barred by drawing a line, or by making a barricade. Barriers of water or fire are often used. To drive away evil from the infant, the Timorlaut natives place it by the fire.[2] Next there is the use of protecting garments and veils, the latter with special reference to the danger of being seen by or seeing the dreaded influence; there is also in this practice a desire not to infest others with the evil to which one is subject. Amongst the Wa-taveta, pregnant women wear veils.[3] The veil is commonly worn by women at menstruation, as by other taboo persons, such as mourners. The King of Susa eats behind a screen.[4] The use of sacred umbrellas probably goes back to the same idea. Amongst the Dyaks an umbrella is placed over a sick person.[5] The common use of amulets to keep off evil needs no illustration. By the use of dummies, one persuades the evil influence that one is dead already, or engages the attention of evil agents, while escape is being effected. The natives of Timorlaut cheat the evil agents by using puppets to represent the sick.[6] In Celebes the sick man is taken to another house and a dummy is left on his bed.[7] To prevent a dead mother taking her child,

[1] E. Casalis, *The Basutos* (1861), p. 277. [2] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

[3] J. Thomson, *Through Masai Land* (1887), p. 61.

[4] Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), iii. 78.

[5] Sir C. A. J. Brooke, *Ten Years in Saráwak* (1866), i. 95.

[6] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 304.

[7] N. Graafland, *De Minahassa* (1869), p. 326.

the Melanesians place a dummy in her arms.[1] The Burmese believe that the patient will recover if he is buried in effigy.[2] A similar method is to pretend that the sick man is already dead,[3] the friends hold a mock funeral with this object in East Central Africa.[4] To avoid sickness the Babar natives set adrift dummies of themselves in a boat, wherein they also place bowls in which their sick friends have spat.[5]

Similar is the use of proxies or substitutes, to keep the danger from the person concerned. Once a year a bull is killed by the Zulus on behalf of the king; the strength of the bull enters him, thereby prolonging his life and health.[6] In Tonga a human victim was slain to "avert the wrath of angry gods from the king."[7]

Again, there is the common practice of giving up to the evil influence a part of one's self, in the large sense in which the savage conceives of such, a piece of one's hair, food, clothing, or the like; the idea being to sacrifice a part to preserve the whole, sometimes the whole man, at other times the whole of a particular organ or sense-process.[8] In the Central Provinces of India, when cholera is about, the priest takes a straw from each house and burns these. Chickens are also driven into the fire and burnt; the idea is that the straws and chickens are substitutes.[9] In Tonga people cut off a little finger to avert calamity. To propitiate the gods

[1] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (1891), p. 275.

[2] Shway Yoe [Sir J. G. Scott], *The Burmans* (1882), ii. 138.

[3] A. Bastian, *Allerlei aus Volks- und Menschenkunde* (1888), i. 437.

[4] J. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 114-115.

[5] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 357.

[6] D. Leslie, *Among the Zulus and Amatongas* (1875), p. 91.

[7] S. S. Farmer, *Tonga and the Friendly Islands* (1855), p. 53.

[8] [Cp. E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), i. 434 *et seq.*, especially i. 470-471.]

[9] C. Grant, *The Gazetteer of the Central Provinces of India* (1870), p. cxvii.

they would cut off a finger-joint, and holding up their hands confess "they had done wrong, but were sorry."[1] Another account says that they would cut off a little finger on the occasion of illness as a propitiatory offering to the gods.[2]

This idea of sacrificing a part seems to be the meaning of cutting off a finger-joint or lock of hair at the grave of a dead person, or during mourning. [In Australia at various points during a funeral ceremony the women cut themselves violently and burn their hair close off.[3] In New Caledonia and in Fiji "the custom of cutting off the little finger, when the decease of a relation required it, seems to have been a most common one; the number of elderly people who have one hand disfigured is great."[4] This custom is general among the North American Indians; among the Comanches, for instance, "Immediately upon the death of a member of the household, the relatives begin a peculiar wailing, and the immediate members of the family take off their customary apparel and clothe themselves in rags and cut themselves across the arms, breast, and other portions of the body, until sometimes a fond wife or mother faints from loss of blood. . . . Those nearly related to the departed, cut off the long locks from the entire head, while those more distantly related, or special friends, cut the hair only from one side of the head. In case of the death of a chief, the young warriors also cut the hair, usually from the left side of the head."][5] Connected with this is the no less

[1] S. S. Farmer, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[2] W. Mariner, *An Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands* (1817), i. 454.

[3] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 348, 353-354.

[4] J. W. Anderson, *Notes of Travel in Fiji and New Caledonia* (1880), p. 220.

[5] F. Grinnell, *in* H. C. Yarrow, "A Further Contribution to the Study of the Mortuary Customs of the North American Indians," *Annual Report of the Bureau of*

logical method of making believe that one's soul is in some object, which is then safely put away, as an external soul.[1]

Another most widely spread method is fasting, the idea of which is to avoid swallowing food which may be tainted by the dangerous influence—to prevent evil entering a man. [That food is regarded as a pollution is well shown by the numerous restrictions placed on its consumption in the higher religions as well as in savage custom.][2] Parallel to this is the method of continence, the object being to retain the source of strength within the body, for if it be allowed to leave the body, the individual will lose strength which he may need for the ghostly conflict, and also the ghostly enemy may use the person's strength thus detached from him to injure him by the method of *ngadhungi*.

Then in cases of actual taboo, where the person concerned is infected with danger, or probably has been, for the primitive mind makes no distinction in its wide generalisation, the commonest method of removing the contagion is purification. The taboo essence, as if exuding from the pores, and clinging to the skin, like a contagious disease, is wiped off with water, the universal cleanser, or similar substances. After menstruation and child-birth, and sickness generally, the contagion is got rid of by a bath. In Shoa "defiled" men, who had eaten forbidden food, were sprinkled with water.[3] The contagion of death is removed in the same way and so is

Ethnology (1881 for 1879-1880), i. 101. Cp. G. Catlin, *Illustrations of the Manners, Customs, and Conditions of the North American Indians* (1876), i. 90, 95.

[1] [Cp. Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), xi. 95 *et seq.*]

[2] See E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), ii. 294 *et seq.*

[3] Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), iii. 147.

the stain of sin from penitents.[1] At a later stage, the water used may be rendered more efficacious by being itself "holy" or "medicinal." Or the patient is purified so by fire, the other great cleanser, or by disinfectants of various sorts, smoke and incense, which are to fire as the offering of incense is to a burnt sacrifice. The chair in which a Manchurian bride goes to the house of the bridegroom is "disinfected" with incense to drive away evil spirits.[2] Or again it is taken off by a rougher method—wiped off with the hands, or a scraper of wood, a sacred strigil, as it were. The following is the description of a Navajo medicine-man's method: he pressed a bundle of stuff to different parts of the body, each time holding up this "receiver" to the smoke-hole, blowing with a quick puff, as if blowing away the evil influence drawn from the body.[3] After births and deaths "defilement" is taken off by the New Hebrideans thus: cocoa-nut milk is poured over the body, or a branch is drawn down body and limbs so as to sweep the substance away.[4] The Maoris remove taboo by water or by passing over the body a piece of wood, which is then buried.[5] Where the evil clings closer, it is beaten off. The method of beating is also used to drive out evil spirits, and there is a natural and easy confusion between the two ideas, as would be the obvious double inference from sickness, for instance. Infected clothes are removed and destroyed. The Navajo who has touched a

[1] H. C. Yarrow, *op. cit.*, i. 123.

[2] J. H. S. Lockhart, "The Marriage Ceremonies of the Manchus," *Folk-Lore* (1890), i. 487.

[3] W. Matthews, "The Mountain Chant: a Navajo Ceremony," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1887 for 1883-1884), v. 420.

[4] B. T. Somerville, "Notes on some Islands of the New Hebrides," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 12.

[5] W. Yate, *An Account of New Zealand* (1835), pp. 104, 137.

dead body takes his clothes off afterwards and washes himself before he mingles with the living.[1] The Cherokees flung their old clothes into the river, supposing that their own impurities were thus removed.[2] The Maori slave who took his clothes off before entering a sacred place which would have infected him with its "sanctity,"[3] was wiser in his generation.

Again, the virus can be taken off and transferred by contact to some one who is more or less always taboo, or is a *corpus vile*, in which case the savage infers that the virus leaves the original sufferer entirely. We infer this because he desires it; when he does not so desire, as in the case of a man's *mana*, the good quality that can be transferred, it passes, but not away. If a Maori chanced to touch anyone's head, he received its "sacredness" by the contact, and had to rub his hands on fern-root, which was then eaten by the head of the family in the female line. Thus his hands became *noa* again.[4] The various Maori methods of "lifting" taboo are called *Whangaihan*. The Tongan method is interesting. If a man contracted taboo from touching a chief, he ceremonially touched the soles of the feet of a superior chief with his hands, and then washed himself.[5] If a man ate food with tabooed hands, he avoided dangerous results by putting the foot of a chief on his stomach. The idea is that by contact the taboo substance is transferred from the man's organs to the chief.[6] A tabooed Maori would free himself from taboo by touching a child, and by taking food from its

[1] H. C. Yarrow, *op. cit.*, i. 123.

[2] J. H. Payne, *in* W. Bartram, "Observations on the Creek and Cherokee Indians," *Transactions of the American Ethnological Society* (1853), III. i. 78.

[3] E. Shortland, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand* (1851), p. 293.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

[5] W. Mariner, *An Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands* (1817), ii. 220.

[6] *Ibid.*, ii. 82.

hands. The man was thus free, but the child was taboo for a day.[1] Of the Maoris it has been said that the "most marked peculiarities of their customs can be traced to the principle that food which has once touched a sacred object becomes itself sacred, and must not be eaten except by the sacred object."[2] Some of the previous cases show how food is used to remove taboo. In Fiji the taboo persons wash, and then wipe their hands on some animal, as a pig. The latter thus becomes sacred to the chief, and they lose the taboo and are free to work, to feed themselves and to live with their wives. When a chief wishes to remove taboo from himself, he transfers it to a priest.[3]

It is an important fact that where ideas of contact underlying social taboo are most thoroughly worked out, as, for instance, amongst the Maoris and the Zulus, the connection of food plays an important part not only in taboo but in its removal. The savage believes not only that what comes out of a man defiles him, but that what enters him does so also, and especially is this so with food. It is food that gives a man his life and strength, and this also may, by forming his very substance, transmit evil to him in the most certain way. By a natural analogy, the evil can best be removed from him by the use of food. Later we shall see[4] how the taking of new food is connected with this. The connection of fasting and silence with taboo is well shown by some methods of removing it, which at the same time remove the obligation to abstinence and the ban of silence.[5] The

[1] E. Dieffenbach, *Travels in New Zealand* (1843), ii. 105.

[2] E. Shortland, *op. cit.*, p. 294.

[3] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-42* (1845), ii. 99-100.

[4] [Below, i. 329.]

[5] [For the rule of silence in connection with mourning see Sir J. G. Frazer, *Folk-lore in the Old Testament* (1918), iii. 71 *et seq.*]

fast incumbent upon mourners is ended in the Nguria tribe by some one touching the lips of the mourner with meat. In this case, as in others, there is combined the idea of rendering the freedom to eat or speak safe, by a rehearsal of the action.[1] The common ban of silence imposed in various ceremonies by the Central Australians is removed by touching the lips with food or some sacred object.[2]

There is another important method: inoculation. The idea is earlier than Jenner and Pasteur; it is one of the oldest and most far-reaching conceptions of mankind. As with all primitive ideas, however, it must be remembered that it has a religious connotation, and is generalised round a much wider circle than even our metaphorical use of the word. As with other earlier theories, so with this, a successful positive instance ensures the general continuance of the method. When the savage inoculates for nearly every danger, as did the Zulus, there might well occur cases where, for instance, small-pox was thus successfully combated. In Abyssinia, when small-pox is raging, they take a boy and inoculate him, and with the lymph supplied by him everyone is inoculated against the disease.[3] There is a curiously strong superstitious fear of lightning amongst the Zulus, doubtless the result of a peculiarity of their climate. A Zulu has explained, "it is this that causes fear in men; the dreaded thing comes from above and not from below. They are afraid of something that looks down upon all of us, not that it will really strike, but the fear arises from thinking that it is a thing above us; we cannot

[1] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), i. 289.

[2] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 248, 381 *et seq.*

[3] Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), ii. 159.

defend ourselves from it, as from a stone thrown by another." This somewhat incoherent statement would apply well enough to the more timid individuals in a civilised and scientific age. Now the Zulu theory is that anything struck by lightning has in it the "power" of the lightning. The doctors make themselves proof against it by inoculation, and are thus also brought into sympathy with electric forces, and know when it is going to thunder. To protect the people, the priests sometimes give orders that an ox struck by lightning must be eaten. After this preventive homœpathic dose they take emetics and wash.[1] Similarly, when a Zulu is about to cross a river full of crocodiles, he will chew some crocodile's excrement, and spatter it over his person in the belief that this will protect him against them.[2] The idea is clearly protection by assimilation through inoculation. Still among the Zulus, if a man wishes to obtain a favour from a chief or great man, or when he is accused of some crime and has to appear before the chief, he tries to get something belonging to the latter, and this he wears next to his skin. So, if a man has an illness, caused, as he thinks, by some animal, the animal's flesh is administered to him.[3] When Kaffirs have killed a lion, they rub their eyes with his skin before they look at his dead body.[4] In West Africa the blood of a slain enemy is drunk by all who have never killed an enemy before.[5] In South Africa warriors are inoculated before battle with a powder made from slain enemies. This is placed by the medicine-man in an incision on the forehead of each

[1] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), pp. 402-403, 380.

[2] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), p. 218.

[3] H. Callaway, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

[4] T. Arbousset *and* F. Daumas, *Narrative of an Exploratory Tour to the North-East of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope* (1846), p. 214.

[5] T. E. Bowdich, *Mission from Cape Coast Castle to Ashanti* (1819), p. 300.

soldier, and gives him strength.[1] The people of New Britain believe that after eating enemies whom they have slain they cannot be injured by the friends of the latter.[2] To avoid the evil effects of a stranger's eye who enters a house where an infant is, a Mentawey father will take off its head covering and give it to the stranger, who, after holding it a while, returns it.[3] The Malays regard the spines of a certain fish as poisonous, but believe that if the brain of the fish is applied to the wound it will act as a complete antidote to the poisonous principle.[4] This idea of the "hair of the dog that bit you" is inoculation after the event, the principle of homœpathy, assimilation to the object which causes injury. This extension brings out the identity of inoculation with other cases of assimilation by contact. The following examples, in which a sort of reverse inoculation takes place, also shows this clearly. Gipsy thieves in Servia put their own blood into the food of one who they suspect knows of their offence. They believe that this prevents him from betraying them, and makes him friendly.[5] A Magyar maiden believes that if she rubs some of her blood in a young man's hair, he will love her as a consequence.[6] A Cherokee bridegroom, if jealous, will rub his saliva on the breast of his sleeping wife, to induce her to be faithful.[7]

[1] J. Macdonald, "Manners, Customs, Superstitions, and Religions of South African Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1891), xx. 133.

[2] W. Powell, *Wanderings in a Wild Country* (1883), p. 92.

[3] C. B. H. von Rosenberg, *Der Malayische Archipel* (1878), p. 198.

[4] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 309.

[5] H. von Wlislocki, "Menschenblut im Glauben der Zigeuner," *Am Ur-Quell* (1892), n.s., iii. 64.

[6] A. F. Dörfler, "Das Blut im magyarischen Volksglauben," *Am Ur-Quell* (1892), n.s., iii. 269.

[7] J. Mooney, "The Sacred Formulas of the Cherokees," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1891 for 1885-1886), vii. 380.

There is often a difficulty about inoculation, namely, the procuring of lymph. Where this can be surmounted, however, many kinds of dangers and spiritual and material "diseases" are prevented from having their fullness of ill result by inoculating the patient against them. As is sometimes the case now, in connection with small-pox, so amongst savages inoculation is chiefly used, sometimes only used, when no other methods avail. The risk due to passing through even a reduced form of the particular danger is one that early man would not lightly undertake. As a rule, he takes no risks and undergoes no pains that he can help, and never except for some serious purpose. It is especially when one is, as it were, in an infected area from which one cannot escape and among infected or dangerous persons with whom one must to some extent associate, that inoculation is seen by the savage, as by us, to be the best method of safety.

Inoculation is the infusion of diseased matter from a diseased person into a healthy person, who by contracting the disease in a very mild form, escapes the full effects which would result in the ordinary course of contraction. In other words, it is a form of contagion, it is the deadly method of Nature used against herself. It is the avoiding of the dangers of taboo by boldly courting them ; taboo is minimised by breaking it. It will be obvious now, first, that the principle of inoculation is the same (differing only in intention) as that of involuntary contagion and of *ngadhungi*, which is only contagion developed. Comparing it with such typical cases as those in which one is involuntarily tainted or inoculated, using the word to sharpen the point, with the dangerous qualities of another, we see its identity with all these ideas of contact. Secondly, it is identical with those love-charms

and similar practices in which you take or receive a portion of the desired person, in order to receive into yourself his desirable properties, or transmit your own hate or love to another. Here are the passive and the active aspects of inoculation.

It is natural that such transmission should be especially effective when performed through the medium of food, for thereby the transmitted property is most surely taken into the system. Of this method in various forms we shall find[1] illustration in ceremonies at puberty and marriage.

[1] [Below, ii. 117 *et seq.*, 226.]

CHAPTER XI

THEORY OF UNION

THE last and most important method of breaking taboo remains to be described. In it the whole cycle of ideas of contact which underlie human relations generally and the relations of the sexes in particular, is completed, and thus the principles on which the ceremonies of marriage, and the marriage system are based receive their full description.

Inoculation was the last method reviewed,[1] and two forms of it were seen : inoculation of one person with the properties of another, and reverse inoculation, by which one person (A) assimilates another (B) to himself by inoculating that other person (B) with himself (A). The method now to be described is simply mutual inoculation of two individuals with each other. A and B being mutually taboo, desire to remove the dangers of their relation ; being destined to live together, or to perform some dangerous act together, or to be in more or less close and therefore potentially dangerous connection, their best method is, as we have seen, inoculation. A therefore inoculates himself against B by taking a part of B into his own system, and B does the contrary ; but this is equivalent to reverse inoculation, for A has practically given B a part of himself and B has reciprocated the gift ; and indeed the two methods here coincide. The results are those which belong to reciprocity ; each has a part of

[1] [Above, i. 280 *et seq.*]

the other in his keeping, and this part not only assimilates each to the other by transmission of properties, but is a pledge, deposit and hostage. Thus identity of interests is secured and the possibility of mutual treachery or wrong is prevented, not only by the fact that injury done to B by A is equivalent to injury done by A to himself, but also by the fact that if B is wronged, he may work vengeance by injuring through his malicious properties or by the method of *ngadhungi* the part of A which he possesses ; and not only this, but, theoretically at least, in such an event, the part of B possessed by A may punish A by the sympathy it still retains with B, its original owner. Each has "given himself away" to the other in a very real sense. Taboo against connection is broken by making the connection, just as Kamehameha broke the taboo by eating with his wives ;[1] and the result is simply union, in the most vital sense, affected by assimilation and passing into identification. But the ideas we have just described underlie all union of this kind, not only in early thought, but implicitly always ; it is simply the psychological principle of union analysed into its component parts. The relation is the full development of contact, which it is unnecessary to trace again in detail. Of the various parts of one's self each and every one may be used. Hair, blood, garments and names are common instances. The idea is also satisfied by each party partaking of the same thing, such as food and drink, flesh and blood, by smoking together, or by dividing a "token," familiar instances being the σύμβολον and split sixpence.[2]

[1] [C. de Varigny, *Quatorze ans aux Iles Sandwich* (1874), p. 42.]

[2] [M. van Gennep, *Les rites de passage* (1909), p. 40, writes that Mr Crawley partly understood the fact that to accept a gift from a person is to tie oneself to that person, but he adds in a footnote (*op. cit.*, p. 40 *n.*[5]), "he interprets wrongly, from a purely individualistic point of view, the lifting of taboo and the rites of union." It

In one of the most striking cases the thing exchanged is the umbilical cord of one party. This is often preserved, as has been seen,[1] and is regarded as very sacred and as possessing part of the life of the original owner. The Narrinyeri have the following custom. The remains of a child's umbilical cord are carefully preserved by the father in a bunch of feathers. The relic is called *kalduke*. This he will give to a man in another tribe who has children, by which act his child and the other man's children become *ngia ngiampe* to each other. The duties of this relation are that they may not touch or come near each other, nor speak to one another, and the usual object of the custom is that these children when grown may be entrusted with the barter of commodities between the two tribes. During such commercial transactions the *ngiampe* persons of course may not speak to each other, and a third person does the talking. Morever, any two individuals may and often do enter this relation for a time, one cutting his own *kalduke* in two and each taking half. They are *ngia ngiampe* as long as they each retain his piece. This relation is often imposed on two individuals to prevent them marrying.[2] This is so typical an example that we may be allowed to use the term *ngia ngiampe* hereafter to express this relation.

It is hardly necessary to give a multiplicity of examples which show each and every one of the possible vehicles of the mutual transmission ; most of these have been mentioned already,[3] in cases of contact and of single inoculation.

seems hardly scientific to reject *a priori* a proposed interpretation of a fact which it is agreed has been rightly understood, if only in part. M. van Gennep also observes (*op. cit.*, p. 42 *n.*[2]) that Mr Crawley failed to understand that all forms of exchange are exactly on a par ; but he must surely have overlooked the passage in i. 286.]

[1] [Above, i. 151-152.]

[2] G. Taplin, "The Narrinyeri," in *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (1879), pp. 32-34.

[3] [Above, i. 123-151.]

The latter practice, as the one-sided application of the principle, should be borne in mind when reviewing the following cases. First of all, lovers not merely symbolise their desire for union by this means, but really effect identification. In Wetar, engaged couples exchange locks of hair, gifts, especially clothes that have been worn, in order to have the smell of the loved one near them.[1] Lovers in Amboina exchange hair, rings and clothes they have worn ;[2] they also drink each other's blood, this being regarded as a "real sacrament."[3] After their first meeting, a Timorlaut girl takes the girdle of the young man, in order to make him faithful to her.[4] Peasant lovers in France used to pledge their affections by spitting into each other's mouths.[5] The practice is most common between lovers, and as a marriage ceremony, effecting union, satisfying love and producing the responsibilities of reciprocity.

The next most common uses are for hospitality and friendship, the making of alliances and covenants between man and man or tribe and tribe, the so-called "blood brotherhood" ; also as a method of making peace, the compact being sealed in various ways, especially by eating together (just as now a bargain is sealed "over a drink"). Throughout the world the closest bond is produced by the act of hospitality, the sharing of one's bread and salt with the stranger within the gates. In the countless examples of this it is often quite naturally found that one side only is concerned (single inoculation), but practically the act, even when no commensality takes place, has all the effect of a reciprocal process. Thus, as

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 447.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 67. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 41. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 300.

[5] Gervasius Tilberiensis, *Otia Imperialis* (1856), p. 72.

we have already noted,[1] in the Mentawey Islands when a stranger enters the house, the father, by way of avoiding the ill-effects of the stranger's eyes upon his child, takes from it its head-covering and gives it to the visitor, who returns it after holding it a while.[2] This case brings out well the fear and caution underlying acts of hospitality.

The biological origin of the whole of the phenomena is shown by the [universal savage mode of greeting "by smelling or sniffing (often called by travellers 'rubbing noses'), which belongs to Polynesians, Malays, Burmese and other Indo-Chinese, Mongols, etc., extending thence eastward to the Eskimo and westward to Lapland . . ."].[3] The biological origin is also clear when the method is the giving of food to a person, and the Greek fashion of drinking a health is a good type of these ideas. The fashion coincides naturally with the practice, illustrated above,[4] of drinking first to show that the drink is not harmful. Such satisfaction of the senses, again, predisposes the consciousness to amity and goodwill; this is an innate human idea. The following illustrates it. The phrase of hospitality in the Society and Sandwich Islands is "let us eat together."[5] Amongst the North American Indians tobacco-smoking, and in the East Indies the chewing of *betel*, have naturally taken over all the ideas attached to food. The passing round of the *calumet* is the regular North American custom of making peace and alliances, and smoking together is a mark of hospitality and friendship. In principle, of course,

[1] [Above, i. 282.]

[2] C. B. H. von Rosenberg, *Der Malayische Archipel* (1878), p. 198.

[3] Sir E. B. Tylor, "Salutations," *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1911), xxiv. 95.

[4] [Above, i. 184-185.]

[5] W. Ellis, *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii* (1826), p. 357.

the act itself produces these results. [There is also the obligation to protect the guest.] Thus, amongst the Bedouin Arabs, as is well known, a guest once received in the tent becomes "one of the family," and the duty of protecting him is sacred. All members of the tribe are also tacitly pledged for the security of his life and property. It is considered discourteous, if not an insult, to ride up to the front of a man's tent without stopping and eating his bread.[1]

Limbus who wish to form an alliance of "brotherhood" exchange ceremonially their scarves and some money, and smear each other's foreheads with rice paste.[2] The Kumis, when making a contract, kill a goat and smear the head and feet of the parties with its blood.[3] The *Tindeko* (blood brotherhood) is very common on the Upper Congo. The blood of the two parties is mingled and put on a leaf, which is then divided and eaten by the pair. "It is a form of cementing friendship and a guarantee of good faith, which is respected by the most unscrupulous; and it possesses a religious significance."[4] [A typical African ceremony of this kind is described by Livingstone: "The hands of the parties are joined . . . small incisions are made on the clasped

[1] [See A. H. Layard, *Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon* (1853), p. 317; J. L. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys* (1830), pp. 100, 192; E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (1871), i. 297. Dr Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), i. 570 *et seq.*, ascribes the phenomena which are being reviewed to the operation of what he terms the "conditional imprecation," and he states (*op. cit.*, i. 590 *n.*[2]) that he cannot subscribe to the view here put forward. As a discussion of Dr Westermarck's theory of the "conditional curse" would take us too far afield, I must content myself with following Dr Westermarck's own example by leaving the reader to decide between the two views.]

[2] Sir H. H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal* (1891), i. p. lviii.

[3] T. H. Lewin, *Wild Races of South-Eastern India* (1870), p. 228.

[4] H. Ward, "Ethnographical Notes relating to the Congo Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 292.

hands, on the pits of the stomach of each, and on the right cheeks and foreheads. A small quantity of blood is taken off from these points in both parties by means of a stalk of grass. The blood from one person is put into one pot of beer, and that of the second into another; each then drinks the other's blood, and they are supposed to become perpetual friends or relations. During the drinking of the beer, some of the party continue beating the ground with short clubs, and utter sentences by way of ratifying the treaty. The men belonging to each of them finish the beer. The principals in the performance of *Kasendi* are henceforth considered blood-relations, and are bound to disclose to each other any impending evil."][1] In the Kayan ceremony a drop of blood from each party is mixed with tobacco and smoked in a cigarette.[2] In Madagascar brotherhood is produced by the two parties drinking each other's blood, in which a piece of ginger is dipped. They then each drink a mixture from the same bowl, praying that it may turn into poison for him who fails to keep the oath.[3] [In Australia the drawing and the drinking of blood on certain occasions "is associated with the idea" that those who take part in the ceremony are bound together in friendship and obliged to assist one another.][4] Friendship is made between villages in Leti, Moa and Lakor by eating flesh and drinking blood together.[5] The following case resumes

[1] D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa* (1857), p. 488.

[2] C. Hose, "The Natives of Borneo," *J.A.I.* (1894), xxiii. 166.

[3] J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde* (1834-1835), i. 81.

[4] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (1904), p. 598; *id.*, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 461.

[5] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 396.

many details, and is among many which prove the present explanation. In Timorlaut friendship is ceremonially sealed thus : the parties offer each other a present, and then take the *ravnoru kida* oath ; a mixture of water, palm wine, and sea-water is prepared, in which a stone or a tooth is placed ; the chief washes the hands of the two parties, and pricks a hand of each, letting the blood drop into the mixture. A prayer is offered to *Dudilaa*, as witness that the one who breaks the oath may pass away like water, become weak like one who has drunk too much palm wine, or sink into the sea like a stone. The two then drink of the liquor, and the stone or tooth is split in two to be kept by the parties as a testimony. Similar covenants between whole villages are sealed by eating together the flesh of a slave.[1]

The practice of exchanging names in order to seal friendship is universal throughout Oceania.[2] The Kingsmill islanders rub noses and exchange names as a mark of friendship.[3] The well-known *taio* system, in Tahiti, for instance, is a good example of this. When voyagers arrived, they were expected each to choose a *taio ;* one exchanged names with him, and thus the two became protector and protected, with "all things in common."[4] In New Guinea the exchange of presents and of names with visitors makes the latter sacred and secure from harm.[5]

[Of the numerous additional modes of exchange, it

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 284.

[2] [See, *e.g.*, J. Cook, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean* (1784), iii. 7 ; C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des stillen Oceans* (1875-1876), ii. 342 ; O. von Kotzebue, *A Voyage of Discovery into the Southern Sea and Beering's Straits* (1821), iii. 172.]

[3] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-1842* (1845), iv. 51.

[4] H. Melville, *Omoo* (1847), p. 154 ; J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *op. cit.*, i. 527.

[5] W. W. Gill, *Life in the Southern Isles* [1876], p. 233.

will be sufficient to give a representative selection.][1] Amongst the Dyoor mutual spitting is used as a salutation, a token of goodwill, a pledge of attachment and an oath of fidelity. It is the proper way to give solemnity to a league of friendship.[2] The same practice is regularly used by the Masai.[3] Amongst the Khamptis "exchange of clothes gives birth to or is a sign of amity; and by exchange of weapons even the most deadly enemies become fast friends, and if one falls in fight, it is the duty of the other to avenge him."[4] The Dusuns of North Borneo exchange weapons to become sworn friends.[5] The same principles underlie the giving and receiving of presents; this is in essence an exchange of one's self. In Buru the interchange of gifts is a regular method of making friendship,[6] as indeed it has been and still is all over the world, since Achilles and Diomed exchanged "gold for bronze." In Central Celebes the same bond of friendship is used.[7] [Among the Oraons of Bengal, when "two girls feel a particular penchant for each other, they swear eternal friendship and exchange necklaces, and the compact is witnessed by common friends. They do not name one another after this ratification of goodwill, but are 'my flower' or 'my gin' or

[1] The subject has been elaborately, perhaps too elaborately, discussed by Sir P. J. H. Grierson. "Brotherhood (Artificial)," *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (1909), ii. 857-871.

[2] G. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa* (1873), i. 205.

[3] J. Thomson, *Through Masai Land* (1887), pp. 165-166. [Cp. S. L. *and* H. Hinde, *The Last of the Masai* (1901), p. 47.]

[4] H. B. Rowney, *The Wild Tribes of India* (1882), p. 162.

[5] F. Hatton, *North Borneo* (1886), p. 196.

[6] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 19.

[7] *Id.*, "De Topantunuasu of Oorspronkelijke Volksstammen van Central Selebes," *Bijdragent tot de Taal-, Land en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* (1886), xxxv. 79.

'my meet to smile' to each other to the end of their lives."][1] In Patagonia there is an elaborate etiquette amongst chiefs; one may not enter the *toldo* of another until presents have been exchanged.

In the next place, *ngia ngiampe* is a common method of settling disputes and of making peace, and in these cases we see clearly the fear of danger which underlies and induces the practice, as we have seen[2] manslayers inoculate their dead foe with themselves or themselves with their dead foe, to secure immunity from his friends or from his ghost. A case may be prefixed which sums up much of the primitive conception. In Buru when a man has been detected in adultery, he has to pay a fine of a pig, with which a feast is prepared for the relatives of both parties. The guilty persons, however, before this can be partaken of, must "drink the oath." So in the same island the manslayer has to pay compensation, something for the head, something for the body, arms, legs, and so on, and also one or more pigs to make a family feast. At the feast he sits apart with a relative of the dead man, before a wooden bowl in which are two plates of food. While eating, the pair exchange plates, and so the wrong is atoned for and peace is made.[3] In the same island, when a family quarrel concerning a divorce has taken place, the ill-feeling is ended by a family feast. Before setting to, the father of the divorced woman puts on the shoulders of her late husband some clothes belonging to his own (the father's) establishment; the husband simultaneously puts on the father a cloth which he himself has brought. Then the husband and

[1] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (1872), p. 253.

[2] [Above, i. 281-282.]

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 18.

the father exchange plates of food. "All this marks reconciliation and will prevent any further quarrel." [1] In Amboina peace is made between villages by a feast.[2] Oaths in the Watubella Islands are taken to terminate quarrels or to make friendship. The "oath" is drunk.[3] Peace is made after war by eating food mingled with the blood of the parties.[4] The people of Luang-Sermata make peace by drinking together.[5] In the Babar Islands the blood of the two parties is mingled with liquor and drunk, both when peace is made between two villages and when two persons form a league of friendship, and also when a man and wife are divorced.[6] In the islands, Leti, Moa and Lakor, when a man has cursed another the injury is put away by the two eating together at a feast made for the purpose ;[7] on these occasions a stick is broken in two and each party keeps a piece. In the ceremonial words uttered at this time, the phrase is used, "Our women shall be sisters and our men brothers." Quarrels between individuals are settled by mutual kisses and by drinking together.[8] At peacemaking in Wetar the parties exchange presents and eat together ;[9] when a bond is made between two individuals or villages, the parties drink each other's blood as a mark of union. The members of such villages may not after this ceremony intermarry.[10] To make a bond of mutual assistance the Timorlaut natives kill a slave, and the two parties eat his flesh.[11] At making peace the Kei islanders ceremonially sever a *kalapa* leaf in two, and each party takes home half.[12] In several of these cases we have the "split token," the *kalduke*. The Ceramese habitually

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 198.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 202.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 324.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 342.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 379.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 389.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 446.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 447.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 279.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 234.

make alliance of friendship by exchanging presents, especially of food;[1] moreover, quarrels between two villages are settled, and peace made after war, in the following way: gifts are exchanged, and a feast is made in one village to which members of the other are invited. The chiefs of both parties drop some of their own blood into a dish of food in which swords and other weapons are dipped—this food they now alternately eat. (Here, by the way, is clearly seen the meaning of the primitive oath.) Then the other village celebrates a feast identical in details with the former, and thus the bond is sealed. Many villages have been through the ceremony which is called *pela*, and "those who have taken part therein may not intermarry, but must help each other in war." A similar process is gone through by parties who are going "head-hunting" together.[2] Amongst the Barea, when "blood vengeance" is satisfied, there results (we may well suppose on the same principles as the cases which we have just considered) "a sort of relationship" between the murderer and the family of the murdered man.[3] The Wakamba make peace together by slaying an animal and eating its flesh together.[4]

Another form of the relation of *ngia ngiampe* is the fairly frequent practice of lending or exchanging wives. A wife, in early thought, is a part of the man. Sometimes it is a case of hospitality, but always it is a very sacred act, and produces the religious results of this relation, as is shown by the Australian taboo between

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 128. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[3] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien* (1864), p. 502.

[4] J. L. Krapf, *Travels, Researches and Missionary Labours during an Eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa* (1860), p. 313.

those who have exchanged their partners.[1] Hospitality, of course, is identical with *ngiampe* relations generally. We shall discuss the practice later,[2] and there point out one particular reason for it. Timorese who have made a pact of friendship in the usual way of *ngiampe*, may lend each other their wives.[3] In theory, of course, the lending will in its turn continue the *ngiampe* relation already begun, as it does in Australia. [Among the Eskimo "an exchange of wives is frequent, each party being often happy to be released, and returning without concern."[4] This was regarded as a sign of friendship.][5] The Northern Indians sometimes exchanged wives for a night. It was esteemed as one of the strongest ties of friendship. If either man died, the other was bound to support his children, a rule which was never broken.[6] [Thus amongst the Northern Tinneh "the momentary exchange of wives was regarded, not as a breach of propriety, but on the contrary as an unsurpassed token of friendship."][7] A case which shows the principle of the custom is the following: in New South Wales when two tribesmen had quarrelled and wished to be reconciled, one would send his wife to the other, and a temporary exchange of partners was made.[8]

[1] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 339.

[2] [Below, i. 337.]

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, "Die Landschaft Dawan oder West-Timor," *Deutsche Geographische Blätter* (1887), x. 230.

[4] L. M. Turner, "Ethnology of the Ungava District, Hudson Bay Territory," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1894 for 1889-1890), xi. 189.

[5] F. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1888 for 1884-1885), vi. 579.

[6] S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort in Hudson's Bay to the Northern Ocean* (1795), p. 129.

[7] A. G. Morice, "The Great Déné Race," *Anthropos* (1907), ii. 33.

[8] A. L. P. Cameron, "Notes on some tribes of New South Wales," *J.A.I.* (1885), xiv. 353.

Very commonly this bond results when persons pass through the same ordeal or ceremony together. Thus amongst the Basutos the boys who have been initiated together as also the girls, form a guild of friends.[1] Amongst Congo tribes the boys who are initiated at the same time practically form a society: through "after life there exists a bond of union between individuals who have been members of this strange fraternity."[2] The same thing is found in the case of Australian boys initiated together.[3] There, also, they are generally made "members of the totem," a sort of "mystical body," which is itself in effect a continuous *ngiampe* relation. There is also a similar bond between the operators and the boys they have operated upon.[4]

The chief result of the mutual act is the duty of mutual respect and mutual assistance. The primitive form of this twofold duty is a taboo against physical personal contact, combined with an obligation, for instance, to assist in war. In many cases, of course, circumstances render the assistance one-sided, becoming, for instance, protection, but the following instances are typical: "Zaid-al-Khail refuses to slay the thief who has surreptitiously drunk from his father's milk-bowl the night before."[5] The protection is produced by eating "even the smallest portion of food belonging to the

[1] K. Endemann, "Mittheilungen über die Sotho-Neger," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1874), vi. 37.

[2] H. Ward, "Ethnographical Notes relating to the Congo Tribes," *J.A.I* (1895), xxiv. 289.

[3] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), p. 198.

[4] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 248; E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 338-339; A. W. Howitt, "The Dieri and other kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *J.A.I.* (1891), xx. 84-85.

[5] W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* (1885), pp. 149-150.

protector." A case is given by Burckhardt of such an incident where an Arab proved that he had eaten of the same date with a member of the tribe.[1] A natural concomitant to the sacred duty of hospitality amongst the Bedouins is the no less important relation which exists between the protector and the protected (*dakheil* and *dakhal*), which involves mutual obligations religiously observed, and good faith fully guarded against all violations and shortcomings. To reproach a man with having broken his *dakheil* is to touch him on the most tender point of honour, for it constitutes the grossest insult in the social ethics of Arab manners. Various acts are employed to confer *dakheil*. Amongst the Shamars, if a man can seize a thread or string, one end of which is held by his enemy, he immediately becomes his *dakheil*. He acquires the privilege of *dakheil* if he only touches the covering of the tent, or even if he can hit it by throwing a weapon at it ; and this right of claiming protection has been carried so far that by spitting upon a man one becomes his *dakheil*. Amongst the Arabs of Sinai, the *dakheil* is only considered effective if the fugitive has contrived to eat or sleep in the tent. If two enemies unexpectedly meet, and the *salam* passes between them, this is regarded as a signal of truce, and they will refrain from every hostile act, although the salutation may have been exchanged by mistake. Another custom which exists among some Arabs, in particular the tribes of the Nedjea, is that of guardian, *wasy*. This institution, which makes a Bedouin who accepts the responsibility the special friend and protector of the family of an Arab even after the death of the latter, is principally designed for the security of minor

[1] J. L. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys* (1830), pp. 186-187.

children, women and old men. The obligation of *wasy* and the claim of the protected are generally mutual and descend by hereditary succession. Almost every Arab is a protector, and is in turn the protected. The means of effecting this is by the present of a camel.[1]

Further, it is clear that while it is this obligation of mutual assistance which is the object of forming this relation, yet the taboo against physical contact is an essential concomitant, which helps us to see the origin of the whole method. The reason for the resulting taboo is that A and B are become identical by transmission of personality, and therefore A avoids all physical contact with B, because it is through physical contact ultimately that all personal injury is effected, and by such contact he might injure himself in B; B on his side has much the same feeling. The idea is well brought out in a Maori belief; if another person ate a man's food, he was regarded as "having eaten the man," and the insult was gross.[2] And so A avoids all physical contact with B, primarily for fear of injuring himself; he will not eat with B, lest he eat himself, nor touch B lest he injure himself by the harm inherent in contact. The feeling is deepened by the fact that it is mutual, and therefore each fears injuring the other, as well as himself, by physical contact. The breaking of the taboo of

[1] [W. R. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 48, 149-150; J. L. Burckhardt, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-187; A. H. Layard, *Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon* (1853), pp. 317-318; E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (1871), i. 297; Lady A. Blunt, *Bedouin Tribes of the Euphrates* (1879), ii. 211; Sir R. F. Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Al-Madinah and Meccah* (1898), ii. 212; C. M. Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta* (1888), i. 228; C. F. Chassebœuf de Volney, *Travels through Syria and Egypt, in the Years 1783-1785* (1788), i. 412. The facts are summarised by A. Featherman, *Social History of the Races of Mankind* (1885-1891), v. 372-373.]

[2] E. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *J.A.I.* (1890), xix. 107.

personal isolation has thus produced a fresh taboo of even greater force, yet still because egoism is its chief factor ; in the original taboo one feared lest one should be injured by the contact of others ; in this one fears lest one injure one's own self as well. The *kalduke* is identical with the *ngadhungi.*

That this is the origin of the taboo and also of the *ngiampe* relation is shown by the following examples. The object of making men who are to go on an expedition drink each other's blood is said by the Central Australians to be the prevention of treachery.[1] In New South Wales when two tribesmen had quarrelled and wished to be reconciled, they made a temporary exchange of wives.[2] In Africa, when a wife is unfaithful, her husband will die if he eat food which she has salted.[3] On the Loango coast bridegroom and bride are required to make a full confession of their sins at the marriage ceremony ; should either fail to do so, or should keep anything back, they will fall ill when eating together as man and wife.[4] In Victoria friends exchange hair as a mark of affection. It is very unlucky to lose this ; should one do so, he asks the other to cancel the exchange by returning his hair. If this were not done, the loser might die. So strong is this belief that persons in such circumstances have been known to fall into bad health, and sometimes actually to die.[5] In the Moluccas a man going to war is at pains to make up any quarrel he may have, for fear the ill-wishes of his adversary

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 461.

[2] A. L. P. Cameron, "Notes on some Tribes of New South Wales," *J.A.I.* (1885), xiv. 353.

[3] D. Macdonald, *Africana* (1882), i. 173.

[4] A. Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an die Loango-Küste* (1874-1875), i. 172.

[5] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (1881), p. 55.

may injure him in battle. Should a man have had an *affaire*, and have given up the woman, he goes to ask her forgiveness before setting out and offers her a present. If she will not be conciliated, he does not go on the expedition for fear of the results.[1] Lovers in the Aru Islands give each other gifts. Hair, however, is not exchanged, for fear that in case of a quarrel the one may make the other ill by burning it.[2] When a lover is jilted in the Babar Islands, he will avenge this by hiding a piece of the girl's hair, or betel that she has used, in a tree. When she becomes a wife and mother her children will die.[3] In Brandenburg it is believed that lovers and married people who eat from one plate or drink from the same glass will come to dislike each other.[4] A similar fear was seen [5] in the illustrations of the primitive oath.

Some typical instances of this resulting taboo are these. Between husbands who have lent each other their wives there is, in Australia, a taboo of a very stringent character, and in other parts of the world a duty enjoining the protection of the children of the lender after his death.[6] Amongst the Dieri boys may not speak to those who have operated upon them at initiation until a present has been given.[7] At the initiation ceremony of the Central Australians a taboo is set between the

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 387.

[2] *Ibid.*, p 262. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 358.

[4] Baron I. *and* Baroness O. von Reinsberg-Düringsfeld, *Hochzeitsbuch* (1871), p. 81.

[5] [Above, i. 155-157.]

[6] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 338-339.

[7] A. W. Howitt, "The Dieri and other kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *J.A.I.* (1891), xx. 84-85.

man who performs the operation and the boy who undergoes it. This is removed by the boy making him an offering of food. The final initiation ceremonies are ended by each initiate bringing an offering of food to his *abmoara* man who decorated him and with whom there is up to now a taboo. It is called man's meat. At this ceremony also the old men are sprinkled with blood from the young men, sometimes into their mouths ; the idea being to strengthen the older men at the expense of the younger. The removal of the taboo is thus : "the man receiving the food sat down, and the young man brought it and put it before him. The old man took it up and held it, and then put it to the young man's mouth. Thus the ban of silence was removed." Previously the ban of approach may be removed by the *abmoara* rubbing him with red ochre.[1] Amongst the natives of the Murray River, those who have officiated at the initiation ceremony never afterwards mention the names of the boys, nor do the latter mention the names of those who have operated upon them. Also, if one gives food or anything else to another, it is either laid on the ground for him to take, or is given through a third person "in the gentlest and mildest manner possible, whereas to another native it would be jerked."[2] In serious cases of illness amongst the Central Australians, a woman's blood is given to a male patient and a man's to a woman. When the patient recovers, he or she may not speak to the person whose blood was given, nor may the latter speak to the convalescent, until a gift of food has been presented. Again, a woman "sings" a mixture of fat and of red ochre, which she then rubs on the body of a sick man. On recovery

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 248, 381-383, 386.

[2] E. J. Eyre, *op. cit.*, ii. 338-339.

he may not speak to her until he has "given her food."[1] Blood is regularly given by men of the Central Australian tribes to each other in order to produce strength; the man whose blood has been taken "becomes *tabu* to him until he releases him from the ban of silence by 'singing over his mouth.'" Blood is drunk at meetings of reconciliation; and in connection with the giving of blood to a man to strengthen him, for instance, when he is going on an avenging expedition, there is the belief that "this partaking together of blood prevents the possibility of treachery."[2] Here we come back to the duty implied by the process, and the sanction which supports it; it is clearly seen also in the *pela* ceremony of the Ceramese,[3] which produces the obligation of mutual assistance in war.

The preparation of a young man for marriage in New Britain is identical with a sort of "initiation." He has to hide in the forest from all his female relatives for three, sometimes six months. Should he happen to meet a female relative, "he does not run away from her, but keeps on his way until they meet, when he will step aside from the road, and hold out to her anything he may have in his possession. She takes it without a word, and they part. It now becomes the duty of the young man's friends to redeem for him that which he may have given to her." Until this pledge is redeemed, he is considered to be in disgrace and is much ashamed.[4] Chiefs in Patagonia will not enter each other's tents until presents have been exchanged.[5] For touching the head of a Maori chief whom he was treating for illness, Mr

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *op. cit.*, p. 464.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 461. [3] [See above, i. 296.]

[4] B. Danks, "Marriage Customs of the New Britain Group," *J.A.I.* (1889), xviii. 287.

[5] G. C. Musters, *At Home with the Patagonians* (1873), p. 184.

Yate was asked to make a payment. He never administered a dose of medicine to a Maori without such a demand from the patient.[1] These are cases of the taboo of personal isolation which is implicit in all human relations. In the following case it is seen as self-respect, which is injured through the breaking of the taboo by an insult. Amongst the Zulus the term *unesisila* ("you have dirt") implies that you have done or said something, or someone has done or said something to you, which has "bespattered you with metaphorical dirt, in Scriptural phrase, 'has defiled you.'" The writer compares the expression, "his hands are not clean." To use this term to another is a gross insult. If a woman has received the worst possible insult a woman can, *omka ninazala*, which means "you will bear children to your father-in-law," she makes a great to-do, and goes to the kraal of the offending person, and kills an animal belonging to him. This is eaten by old women or little children, but not by anyone of marriageable age. "The beast has received into its substance the *insila* which has now left the woman who received the insult."[2]

The balance is set right by reparation, the receipt of a present being identical in principle with the taking of something from the other party. The various methods of breaking the taboo of personal isolation reproduce the state of taboo once more. The taboo is broken, and the breaking produces another taboo, which in its turn may be broken. This is inevitable from the principles which underlie the practice, and the fact also proves those principles. These cases naturally lead up to what may be called continuous *ngiampe*. A principle of contact is, once in contact always in contact; and this is actualised

[1] W. Yate, *An Account of New Zealand* (1835), pp. 104-105.

[2] D. Leslie, *Among the Zulus and Amatongas* (1875), pp. 169, 174-175.

in permanent relations, *ngiampe* in theory, such as between friends and lovers, between husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister.

When we remember the pregnant meaning which personal contact has in all its forms amongst primitive men, it becomes less difficult to realise the superlative importance of such a relation as this. It is, without doubt, in primitive thought, a bond of such transcendent strength and inviolability, owing to the sensitive individualism of early man, who practically regards every part of himself as sacred, that we may look in vain through history for a tie of equal power. Certainly no ordinary ancient or modern conception of the duties of kinship has such force, nor even modern principles of honour and similar moral ties ; the primitive bond is the most binding categorical imperative invented by man, and in its origin and results alike, seems on a par with laws of nature ; it is a kind of physical "identity in difference." The theory of Maine, that status precedes contract, and that contract is unknown in primitive culture, needs revision.[1] His evidence applies to barbarism, not to savagery.

Further, the same idea, though not developed to its logical conclusion, though this is always ready to become actual instead of potential, runs through all ideas of contact, especially when consciously mutual. In eating together, the *kalduke* is the food ; in sexual intercourse there is a similar conception. Sometimes the *kalduke* is split in two—and here we have the world-wide practice

[1] [Sir H. S. Maine, *Ancient Law* (1906), p. 174. The opinion expressed in the text has since received the support of Sir Frederick Pollock, the editor of the edition cited, who writes (in *op. cit.*, p. 183) : "As regards the actual definition of different personal conditions, and the more personal relations incidental to them, it does not seem that a movement from Status to Contract can be asserted with any generality."]

of dividing a "token"—of which each of the two parties keeps a piece. All who have anything in common, even a common aim or sympathy, are potentially in this relation, and the idea of *ngia ngiampe* is inherent in their reciprocal attitude. The thief and his partner, the confessor and his penitent, those who share the same dwelling, the same trade, those who are of the same sex or the same age, those who have the same totem, the same kindred, the same god (in Fiji, where distant towns have the same gods, the inhabitants have the privilege of doing as they please in each other's town)[1]—all these are potentially bound by the same principle. The idea goes all round the circle of human relations, and is potentially existent wherever there is a mutual connection. The more subtle sort is found where contact is continuous. To husband and wife, the *kalduke* is the marriage-bed, the living together, the child, born or unborn; this is illustrated by the phrase, common to many languages, which describes the child as a "pledge." True, it is often as a pledge of wifely chastity, but this is not merely an extension, but is the same idea only half expressed. The fidelity of the wife is the chief attitude required of her by the *ngia ngiampe* relation. Between lovers, besides love-tokens, lovers' knots and so-called charms and the like, the relation of *ngia ngiampe* underlies the kiss, the embrace and any contact. Between friends, also, the clasp of hands, the embrace, the savage so-called rubbing of noses, show the principle. Freemasonry is an interesting case of an institution based on this.

These psycho-physical ideas continue into the psychical phenomena of emotion and cognition; they are here more subtle, but no less enduring, whatever the

[1] W. T. Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences* (1866), p. 364.

refinement of culture may be. In connection with the phenomena of ideation, we spoke[1] of the memory-image of a man's foe impressed upon his brain; another instance would be the memory-image of a loved person. In both, and any similar cases, the memory-image is identical in kind, though necessarily less material in degree, with the *kalduke* of the Australian black-fellow. The image is the man's self in the keeping of another; in the one case it is an Erinys, the spiritual image of one who is hated and feared, in the other that of one who loves. In both cases it is a man's self transferred to another, and bringing with it all the ideas of hostage and pledge; and when the matter is reciprocal, there is the complex reciprocity which is seen in all mutual contact and personal relation. Again, the same applies, though necessarily the occurrence is sporadic, to the reflection of a person's image which he himself can see in the *retina* of the other. In the connection of love, this is a favourite commonplace of poetical and popular thought. "And she said: 'See, thy image is reflected a thousand times in these gems that reflect thee; yet look in my eyes, and thou shalt see thyself through their reflection in my heart.' Then the king looked into her eyes, and saw himself reflected in them like the sun in a deep lake. And he whispered in the shell of her ear: 'Thou hast robbed me of myself, give me back myself in thy form.'"[2] Again, in connection with the idea we saw reason to attribute to primitive man,[3] namely, that all apparently abnormal or unusual states of emotion, such as sudden anger or ecstasy, or the surging of love, when close contact with another attends these states, as, for instance,

[1] [Above, i. 94.]

[2] F. W. Bain, *A Digit of the Moon* (1901), p. 117.

[3] [See above, i. 30-31.]

in the case of love, both in popular language and in psychology there is recognised the idea that, if the emotional state is "transmitted," if, as we say, A is "infected" with B's enthusiasm or love, A is "inspired" with B, then B is transferred to him, and so we come to the *kalduke* again.

Lastly, the whole set of ideas is of course the psychological basis of union, physical and spiritual, and well shows the materialistic workings of the human brain. Mutual inoculation, *ngia ngiampe*, is union looked at from within. It should be noted also that the next category to that of union is identity, and it is interesting to trace in the thought and practice of mankind, as we may in these phenomena, both the recognition of this metaphysical truth and the attempt to realise it in human intercourse. As Aristophanes puts it of lovers in the *Symposium:* "Suppose Hephaestus, with his instruments, to come to the pair who are lying side by side and to say to them, 'What do you people want of one another?' they would be unable to explain. And suppose further, that when he saw their perplexity he said: 'Do you desire to be wholly one; always day and night to be in one another's company? for if this is what you desire, I am ready to melt you into one and let you grow together, so that being two you shall become one, and while you live live a common life as if you were a single man, and after your death in the world below still be one departed soul instead of two—I ask whether this is what you lovingly desire, and whether you are satisfied to attain this?'—there is not a man of them who when he heard the proposal would deny or would not acknowledge that this meeting and melting into one another, this becoming one instead of two, was the very expression of his ancient need." And he

visualises the whole psychology of love-practices and marriage-ceremonial in the *mythos*, worthy of the poet of the *Clouds*, in which the earliest man was a bisexual hermaphrodite being, "having a name corresponding to this double nature, which had once a real existence, but is now lost, and the word 'Androgynous' is only preserved as a term of reproach . . . the primeval man was round, his back and sides forming a circle ; and he had four hands and four feet, one head with two faces, looking opposite ways, set on a round neck and precisely alike ; also four ears, two privy members, and the remainder to correspond. He could walk upright as men now do, backwards or forwards as he pleased, and he could also roll over and over at a great pace, turning on his four hands and four feet, eight in all, like tumblers going over and over with their legs in the air ; this was when he wanted to run fast." Primeval man became proud, and would have laid hands on the gods, and Aristophanes now gives his version of the Fall, making Zeus say : "Methinks I have a plan which will humble their pride and improve their manners ; men shall continue to exist ; but I will cut them in two and then they will be diminished in strength and increased in numbers ; this will have the advantage of making them more profitable to us. They shall walk upright on two legs, and if they continue insolent and will not be quiet, I will split them again and they shall hop about on a single leg. He spoke and cut men in two, like a sorb-apple which is halved for pickling, or as you might divide an egg with a hair ; and as he cut them one after another, he bade Apollo give the face and the half of the neck a turn in order that the man might contemplate the section of himself : he would thus learn a lesson of humility. Apollo was also bidden to heal their wounds and com-

pose their forms. So he gave a turn to the face and pulled the skin from the side all over that which in our language is called the belly, like the purses which draw in, and he made one mouth at the centre, which he fastened in a knot (the same which is called the navel): he also moulded the breast and took out most of the wrinkles, much as a shoemaker might smooth leather upon a last; he left a few, however, in the region of the belly and navel, as a memorial of the primeval state. After the division the two parts of man, each desiring his other half, came together, and throwing their arms about one another, entwined in mutual embraces, longing to grow into one, they were on the point of dying from hunger and self-neglect, because they did not like to do anything apart. . . ." In short, "human nature was originally one and we were a whole, and the desire and pursuit of the whole is called love." [1]

This reintroduction of a state of taboo, connoting mutual caution, respect and religious responsibility, has had a profound influence on the development of morality. In it we can see the religious nature of human relations, and the connection between morality and religion, in any sense of the latter term. It illustrates clearly the growth of the conception of responsibility to others, and marks the psychological process whereby altruism emerges from egoism, the two impulses being indeed but two sides of one idea, for man is both an individual and a social creature. As to the new taboo, the primitive form of the idea of mutual responsibility, the characteristics of the state are of course somewhat different from the original taboo of isolation; the dangers there were those

[1] Plato, *Symposium* 190-192; Jowett's translation, *The Dialogues of Plato* (1892), i. 559-562.

arising from ignorance; these, now the original taboo has been removed by breaking it, a removal which forms union, a completion as it were of some magnetic circuit, or a double inoculation, these are the dangers which will result from breaking a bond which is as strong as death, for it is a bond made by giving one's own life in pawn, and thus they are the basis of duty.

When the mind has completed its inference of a superior power, this power is set up as the judge and upholder of such relations, and a man may say to his friend or lover, as the token is exchanged, "Mizpah. The Lord watch between me and thee, when we are absent from one another." Taking another feature, the primitive oath is first, the man's self, then his substitute or pledge in the thing administered, and later, the god who exacts vengeance on the perjured.

To return, the brief statement that in the Marquesas "friends are *tabu*" gives the whole case in a nutshell. They are taboo to each other as the result of their intercourse, their contact, in fine, the *kalduke*. We can see the idea of the original taboo combined with the later one of mutual duty, in the taboo resulting in Australia between the men who perform the operation at puberty and the boys who undergo it. They have been in a peculiarly intimate relation, body and soul as it were have been exposed and made naked to each other's eyes, a dangerous service has been performed, and its results may be dire. Therefore, they may not speak to each other. The ban is removed by a present of food.[1] This act of union removes the original dangers but introduces a relation of sympathy and duty. We also

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), p. 248.

saw[1] that the *ngia ngiampe* of the Narrinyeri are taboo in that they may not speak, but their mutual responsibility is such that they are expressly made in order to conduct barter, their fairness has been, that is, rendered above suspicion. Exactly the same relation is induced between godparents and the like, and their *protégés*, as between the black-fellow and the boy. The sponsors or "bridesmen" of a Beni-Amer bride have a peculiar relation with her. They may not speak to her for the rest of her life, but they are sworn to defend her and protect her, and actually do so when her husband's conduct requires it.[2] We observed above[3] that the forming of alliances by eating together prevented the possibility of treachery on the part of either concerned. The ceremony is often performed for this purpose only, just as is single inoculation. For a man will not betray his own flesh; just as duty is shown by not eating one's own totem or even looking at it.

These cases lead up to two results, most important for our present purpose. In the first place, we put it that, taking into account all the evidence, psychological and ethnological, concerning human relations, we have here the most important primitive conception of relationship. The biological tie is not so obvious as are those of physical contact, nor is the idea of blood-kinship at all an early conception. Those who hold that the blood-covenant is the original of which all these other cases are deteriorations, are obliged to use the most forced analogies, and we do not think it necessary to point these out, for they are quite obvious. Nor is there, in any example quoted, any primary idea of making a man

[1] [Above, i. 287.]

[2] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien* (1864), p. 325.

[3] [Above, i. 301.]

of the same kin ; the idea is to identify two individuals, *quâ* individuals. Again, close daily contact is for the savage a more important tie than that of kinship, except in the case of a parental kinship, especially that of mother and child ; blood-kinship is only one form of human relations, and that not the most potent. The tie or *kalduke* of having the same mother is the basis of the maternal system, the tie or *kalduke* of physical close contact is the basis of all primitive kinship ; as opposed to later ideas of "blood" the basis is this daily contact, which is a continuous *ngiampe* relation. To the savage mind blood is only one variety of human substance, though an important one. Enquirers often, it is to be noted, confuse the care taken of blood as being part of an individual with the later idea of "blood" as a term for kinship. Lastly, all these cases of *ngiampe* may be in theory, as in practice they are, taken under the category of friendship, and friendship is a far stronger psychological tie than kinship of blood. We shall return[1] to this conception of relationship later, and also to the next result. This is that very interesting detail in the Narrinyeri, Wetarese and Ceramese customs. In the first of these persons are sometimes placed in the *ngia ngiampe* relation for the express purpose of preventing them from marrying. In the two latter cases, all who have been through the *pela* ceremony of eating together, such as accomplices in head-hunting, and members of two villages who have thus made peace, are bound to help each other in war, but may not intermarry. To these may be added the fact that "sponsorship" and "gossipry" in European custom are bars to marriage, both between the sponsors themselves and between them

[1] [Below, ii. 203 *et seq.*]

and the family, for a member of which they have been acting.

These facts supply the second part of the reason why brothers and sisters and those who live together may not marry. Before the sexual taboo is removed, that taboo prevents intercourse of all kinds, including marriage, between such persons; when it has been removed, either by a definite ceremony, as at initiation, or by a recognition of a continuous *ngia ngiampe* in living together, eating together, and the like, the resulting principles of this new relation also prevent intercourse, including marriage. The same fears which led up to and which enforce *ngia ngiampe*, now, in the form of duty, prevent what the original taboo prevented; and the prohibition, being superimposed on a continuous biological relation, becomes strengthened when the latter is fully recognised. Put shortly, the *ngiampe* relation prevents all physical contact, and marriage is a permanent form of physical contact. More as to this hereafter;[1] meanwhile we may note that the Narrinyeri, Wetarese and Ceramese customs have not yet, so far as we are aware, been employed by the supporters of the theory that primitive kinship was welded by a conception of the blood-tie, which in its legal pedantry is quite unprimitive. They would doubtless explain the rules of the Narrinyeri, Wetarese and Ceramese as analogies from the blood-covenant, but if so, why should there be a taboo preventing the two parties, when of the same sex, from speaking to each other and from having any physical contact? Blood-relations do not usually send each other to Coventry. Why again should a godfather and a godmother not marry, though theoretically

[1] [Below, ch. xiv.]

married? It is more scientific to argue from the development of the conception of blood-relationship and blood-covenant alike from the elementary ideas of human relations. The cause which prevents these people from marrying is identical with that which prevents them in the like relation both from betraying one another, and from having any physical contact, the relation of marriage being in primitive thought a dangerous one; and between those who are identified with each other by exchange of personality, no reciprocal act which may injure either through the other, and thus poison the connection, may be performed.

CHAPTER XII

THEORY OF CHANGE AND EXCHANGE

A DIGRESSION, in which another application of the ideas of contact will be brought out, is necessary to throw further light on some particular features of the subject. The common practice of disguise is used to avoid both real and imaginary danger. Thus the New Caledonians, when about to murder a man, put on grotesque masks so as not to be recognised,[1] just as the highwayman of romance was wont to wear a black mask. In war the Tongans change their war costume at every battle, by way of disguise.[2] [The use of masks and other methods of disguise at all forms of religious ceremony is very widespread.][3] Sir James Frazer has shown that mourning attire is a disguise, being generally the reverse of ordinary wear,[4] [a good example being the custom of the Bohemians, who put on masks and act in an unusual manner while they are returning from a burial].[5] Again, in Egypt the children who are most beloved are the

[1] J. W. Anderson, *Notes of Travel in Fiji and New Caledonia* (1880), p. 222.

[2] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-42* (1845), iii. 10.

[3] [See W. H. Dall, "Masks, Labrets, and Certain Aboriginal Customs," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1884 for 1881-1882), iii. 67 *et seq.*; R. Andree, *Ethnographische Parallelen und Vergleiche* (1878), pp. 107 *et seq.*; A. Bastian, "Die Masken in der Völkerkunde,' *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* (1883), xiv. 335 *et seq.*]

[4] Sir J. G. Frazer, "Certain Burial Customs as Illustrative of the Primitive Theory of the Soul," *J.A.I.* (1886), xv. 73; cp. *ibid.*, pp. 98 *et seq.*

[5] A. Bastian, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (1860), ii. 328.

worst clad. One may often see a fine lady walking in a magnificent dress, and by her side a boy or girl, her own child, its face smeared with dirt, and wearing clothes which look as if they had not been washed for months. The intention is to avoid the evil eye.[1] The Chinese believe that certain evil spirits attempt to ruin the health of bright and promising children. To delude the spirit they shave the child's head and call him "little priest," treating him as a worthless child and as of no more consequence than a despised Buddhist priest. They also use derogatory epithets and names, so as to make the evil spirits think that they care little about the child. Sometimes they have it adopted into another family for the same reason.[2]

An interesting form of disguise, which is found in early custom as well as in modern romance,[3] is the wearing of the dress of the other sex; it is generally the male sex who adopt the disguise, and no doubt in many cases the same idea is present as that which leads to the wearing of rags and of dirty clothes; evil influences are more likely to pass over the sex which, from the male point of view, is the less important. The ancient Lycians were ordered by their law to wear woman's dress when they mourned a dead relative.[4] Plutarch explains it as "by way of showing that mourning is

[1] E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptian* (1871), i. 60.

[2] J. Doolittle, *Social Life of the Chinese* (1867), ii. 229.

[3] [When Mr Crawley first put forward the theory described in the present paragraph in "Achilles at Skyros," *The Classical Review* (1893), vii. 243-245, Andrew Lang criticised his suggestion and put against it the view, though hardly with his usual perspicacity, that the changing of the dress of Achilles was no more than a literary artifice; see A. Lang, "The Youth of Achilles," *The Classical Review* (1893), vii. 294-295.]

[4] Valerius Maximus, *De factis dictisque memorabilibus*, XII. vi. 13.

effeminate, that it is womanly and weak to mourn. For women are more prone to mourning than are men, barbarians than Greeks, and inferior persons than superior. Among barbarians again, it is not the most manly races such as Kelts and Gauls, but Egyptians, Syrians and Lydians who indulge most in mourning. The latter when mourning go into pits and will not look upon the sun."[1]

When an Egyptian boy is circumcised, at the age of five or six, he parades the streets, dressed in female clothes and ornaments, borrowed from some lady. In front of him also walks a school friend, evidently taking his place as a proxy, for he wears round his neck the boy's own writing-tablet. A woman sprinkles salt behind the boy to counteract the evil eye ; this is doubtless the reason for the whole procedure of dressing as a female.[2] [At the same period of circumcision Masai boys wear women's clothes and put on earrings ; this attire they retain until their wounds are healed.[3] Among the Nandi the female dress and ornaments are put on before the circumcision, and they are not taken off until some months after ; before the parallel operation is performed on the girls, these put on men's dress and carry clubs in their hands.][4] Possibly the story of Achilles is connected with some such idea ; [as a boy he was secluded in the island of Scyros by Peleus and Thetis, the intention of his parents being to save him from the early death to which he was doomed. He was dressed as a girl, and lived at the court of Lycomedes as one of the king's daughters, his disguise being at length

[1] Plutarch, *Consolatio ad Appolonium*, 22.
[2] E. W. Lane, *op. cit.*, i. 61-62, ii. 279.
[3] A. C. Hollis, *The Masai* (1905), p. 298.
[4] *Id.*, *The Nandi* (1909), pp. 53-58.

penetrated by Odysseus.] Achilles also had his name changed, another method of disguise, Issa and Pyrrha being mentioned as the name taken. Similarly, to conceal the infant Dionysus from Hera, Zeus gave him to Hermes, who took him to Ino and Athamas with orders to nurse him as a girl.[1] In the Babar Islands a party of women bury the *placenta*. If the child is a boy, they wear male girdles, if a girl, female *sarongs*.[2] Here the idea is sympathy. When Zulus undertake the "black ox sacrifice" which produces black rain, the chief men put on the girdles of young girls.[3] This idea is extended amongst the same people into a method of keeping off sickness from the cattle by changing their keepers, thus: when cattle disease is prevalent and expected, it is kept off by the *umkuba*, the custom of the girls herding the cattle for a day. All the girls and unmarried women rise early, dress themselves entirely in their brothers' clothes, and taking their brothers' knockberries and sticks, open the cattle-pen and drive the cattle to pasture, returning at sunset. Not one of the opposite sex dares to go near them on this day or to speak to them.[4] Here the principle is, as it were, allopathic, change of sex being a method of changing the luck or of averting bad luck. ["The practice of dressing boys as girls, and girls as boys to avert the evil eye, is not uncommon in the Konkan, and sometimes this superstition is carried to such an extent, that in order to make the boy appear a genuine girl, even his nose is bored and a nose-ring

[1] Ptolemaeus Hephaestionis, *Nova Historia* i.; Appolodorus, *Bibliotheca*, iii. 3; Nonnus, *Narrationes*, ii. 19.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 354.

[3] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), p. 93.

[4] E. G. Carbutt, "Some Minor Superstitions and Customs of the Zulus," *Folk-Lore Journal* (Cape Town, 1880), ii. 12-13.

put into it."[1] In Oudh it is a common practice to dress little boys as girls to keep off the evil eye;[2] similarly it is usual "to bore the nose of a long-wished-for son as soon as he is born to turn him into a girl. This is done to avoid *nazar*, to which boys are more liable than girls."[3] This custom is well illustrated by the following story: "A very perplexing mistake occurred as to the sex of a girl lately born to the Mahárájá of Maisúr. I believe it is customary among Hindús to reverse the sex of a newly-born child, in order to avoid the evil eye, when notifying it for the first time—a fact of which the midwife, a European, was not aware of, or it did not occur to her at the time, and of course she mentioned what the child *really* was. The news was at once conveyed to the Mahárájá that the latest arrival was a girl, and the supposed fact whispered to him that it was a boy. This spread like wild-fire, and it was not till late in the day that it was known that a princess, and not a prince, was the cause of the rejoicing."[4] In the Swiss Frei- and Kelleramt boys and girls exchange their clothes on the Monday after the Shrove Sunday celebrations; this is done as a mode of disguise.][5]

Any sort of change or substitution may be used to escape danger. In Amboina, if a couple have lost several children, they will give the next to another woman to suckle.[6] Change of name is a common method

[1] P. B. Joshi, "On the Evil Eye in the Konkan," *The Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay* (1886-1889), i. 123.

[2] *Panjab Notes and Queries* (1883-1884), i. 112, *note* 869.

[3] *Ibid.*, i. 137, *note* 1029.

[4] *Bangalore Spectator*, quoted in *Panjab Notes and Queries* (1884-1885), ii. 94, *note* 570.

[5] S. Meier, "Volkstümliches aus dem Frei- und Kelleramt," *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunae* (1905), ix. 128.

[6] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

of avoiding danger or of altering luck. A barren woman in Ceramlaut changes her name.[1] Amongst the Lopars every time the child fell ill the christening was repeated and the name changed.[2] Similarly amongst the Kingsmill islanders.[3] If a Malay child fall ill after receiving its name, it is adopted by another family, who give it a different name ;[4] [a custom identical with this one is found in China.[5] In the Punjab it is a favourite device to give a child whom its parents are anxious to protect, a name which conveys a contemptuous meaning ; thus, if one child has been lost by small-pox, he will probably give the next child some such name as Márú (bad), Chúhrá (scavenger), Chhittar (an old shoe), Chhajú (as worthless as a winnowing basket), or Nathú (having a nose-ring in his nose),[6] the last of these names being obviously due to the practice, examples of which have been noted from Oudh and the Konkan,[7] of boring a boy's nose to receive nose-rings in order to make him look like a girl. According to another writer, the custom in Bihar "when a man's elder children die, to give any children that may be subsequently born, names signifying an unpleasant or disgusting object, and also to bore their noses . . . obtains amongst all castes from Brâhmans down." A list of some fifty such names is appended, which includes reptiles, insects and other

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

[2] V. H. Mikhailovskii, "Shamanism in Siberia and European Russia," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 148.

[3] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-42* (1845), v. 102.

[4] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900), p. 34.

[5] J. Doolittle, *Social Life of the Chinese* (1867), ii. 229.

[6] J. M. Dowie, in *Panjab Notes and Queries* (1883-1884), i. 26, *note* 219; cp. Sir R. C. Temple, in *ibid.* (1884-1885), ii. 93, *note* 561.

[7] [Above, i. 320-321.]

animals, but which is largely made up of personal characteristics, physical, moral and mental, such as blind, one-eyed, mad, fool, scoundrel, despised.[1] Sometimes these names, instead of being derogatory are sexless, or emphasise the change in sex which it is desired to pretend: ". . . a practice very prevalent in the Firôzpur district among all classes and sects, but particularly among Sikhs and Hindus, is to dress up a son born after the death of previous sons as a girl. Such children have their noses pierced in signification of their being converted into girls, the pierced nose being the female mark *par excellence*. The mother makes a vow to dress up her boy as a girl for from four to ten years, the hair is plaited, women's ornaments worn, etc., and naked little boy-girls, as it were, can be seen running about in any village. Even where the custom is not fully carried out, the nose is pierced and a sexless name given, thus—Nathu (nostril) . . . Chhedî (pierced), Bulâgî (nose-ring)."][2] The custom is very common throughout the world, and we may begin the next argument with this practice.

The savage boy receives a new name at puberty and gives up his old one, just as does the Catholic novice and the Catholic priest and nun, and so does the Yoruba novice at the end of his novitiate for the priesthood take a new name.[3] What is the idea behind the practice? it is part of a very widely-spread human impulse to change one's identity, and the possibility of the change is more than half believed. As the infant at baptism was rescued from Satan, and became by the washing away of the "old

[1] G. A. Grierson, "Proper Names," *The Indian Antiquary* (1879), viii. 321-322.

[2] F. A. Steel, "Folk-lore in the Panjab," *The Indian Antiquary* (1881), x. 332.

[3] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), p. 97.

Adam" a new creature, receiving a name as the symbol of its new life, as a warrior who has slain a foe takes his name to add to his own personality the properties of the owner, and sometimes to avoid reprisals by so doing, and as the novice turns his back on the old life and begins a new life, so there are occasions in every man's existence when he would gladly for various reasons become "another man," and in early society this was thought possible. These things that are changed to effect the transformation are parts of the man's life or soul, such as names and garments, and represent his whole being.

Let us take some cases which prove this belief in change of personality. When a Central Australian is made a medicine-man, he is supposed to be killed by a spirit, who removes all his internal organs and supplies the novice with a new set. After this the man returns to life [though in a condition of insanity, from which, however, he soon recovers.][1] The Kaffir word used to express the initiation of a priest to his office, "means 'renewal,' and is the same that is used for the first appearance of the new moon, and for the putting forth of the grass and buds at the commencement of spring. By which it is evidently intended to intimate that the man's heart is renewed, that he has become an entirely different person from what he was before, seeing with different eyes and hearing with different ears."[2] The closing ceremony of the initiation of Kaffir boys is that they are chased to the river, where they wash off the white clay they have been smeared with during their separation ; then everything connected with their stay is collected in the hut they have lived in, and the whole is

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 523-524.

[2] J. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (1858), p. 79.

burned. The boys are smeared with fat and red clay, and are given new *karosses*. They then depart, being careful not to look back upon the burning hut, lest some supernatural evil should befall them, and they therefore cover their heads.[1] Amongst the Congo negroes boys and girls are initiated at puberty, each set of boys and each set of girls forming a sort of secret society, called *N'Kimba* and *Fua-Kongo*. The rite is commonly precipitated when it is supposed that the women are not bearing enough children. The person being initiated is supposed to die and to rise again. At the end of the ceremonies the initiates take new names and pretend to have forgotten their former life; they do not even recognise their parents and friends.[2] [The distribution of these ceremonies at puberty and kindred occasions, in which the candidate is given a new name, or otherwise shown to have taken on new life, is world-wide, as Sir James Frazer has shown.[3] The following account by Jonathan Carver, of a scene witnessed by him in North America is typical; the body to which admission was sought on this occasion was "the friendly society of the Spirit" among the Naudowessies, who inhabited the region of the Great Lakes. The candidate, on kneeling before the chief, was told by the latter that "he himself was now agitated by the same spirit which he should in a few moments communicate to him; that it would strike him dead, but that he would instantly be restored again to life; to this he added, that the communication, however terrifying, was a necessary introduction to the advantages enjoyed by the community into which he was on the point of

[1] J. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (1858), p. 99.

[2] H. Ward, "Ethnographical Notes relating to the Congo Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 289.

[3] Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), xi. 225 *et seq.*

being admitted. As he spoke this, he appeared to be greatly agitated, till at last his emotions became so violent that his countenance was distorted and his whole frame convulsed. At this juncture he threw something that appeared both in shape and colour like a small bean at the young man, which seemed to enter his mouth, and he instantly fell as motionless as if he had been shot." After a while the candidate returned to life by spitting out the object thrown at him by the chief.][1]

As will be seen when initiation itself is discussed,[2] the "old life" put away by the boy at puberty is that of women, the life of the nursery; and we may suppose that the ideas of sexual taboo fixed somewhat of the same belief upon the purification of infants, that is to say, the infant is baptised or purified from the taboo state in which childbirth left it and the mother, a state of ceremonial uncleanness arising from the breaking-up, as it were, of women's organism, and the diffusion of her sexual properties.

Further, this desire to efface the past, to put off the "old man" and to put on the new, is very clearly brought out in those festivals and other observances, generally annual and often coinciding with the beginning of the new year, celebrated by whole communities.[3] Thus, in old Peru, the people held an annual ceremony, the object of which was to banish all ills. [They rubbed a certain paste over all the parts of their bodies that the paste might take away their infirmities; later they shook their clothes, crying, "Let the evils be gone"; and they then passed their hands over their bodies, as if in the act of washing;] they bathed also, exclaiming that their

[1] J. Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America* (1781), pp. 271-275. As to the nature of the object thrown at the novice by the chief, see Sir J. G. Frazer, *op. cit.*, xi. 267 *n.*[2].

[2] [See below, ii. 1 *et seq.*]

[3] [Cp. H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1910), vi. 221.]

maladies should leave them.[1] The Iroquois had an annual expulsion of evils, preceded by a general confession of sins.[2] Once a year the members of an Eskimo tribe assemble [in order to drive out whatever evil spirits may be present in their houses. For this purpose a long hunt is begun, not to be completed until the spirits have been driven into a great fire, there to be mercilessly treated by the gathered Eskimos.][3] The Cherokees had a new year's festival; [it "was celebrated shortly after the first new moon of autumn, and consisted of a multiplicity of rigorous rites, fastings, ablutions and purifications. Among the most important functionaries on the occasion were seven exorcisers or cleansers, whose duty it was, at a certain stage of the proceedings to drive away evil, and purify the town. Each one bore in his hand a white rod of sycamore. The leader, followed by others, walked round the national heptagon, and coming to the treasure or store-house to the west of it, they lashed the eaves of the roofs with their rods. The leader then went to another house, followed by the others, singing, and repeated the same ceremony until every house was purified. This ceremony was repeated daily during the continuance of the festival. In performing their ablutions they went into the water and allowed their old clothes to be carried away by the stream, by which means they supposed their impurities removed."][4] In Korea, on the fourteenth

[1] [Garcilasso de la Vega, *First Part of the Royal Commentaries of the Yncas* (1869-1871), ii. 228 *et seq.*]

[2] P. F. X. de Charleroix, *Histoire et description generale de la Nouvelle France* (1744), vi. 82 *et seq.*; L. H. Morgan, *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois* (1851), pp. 207 *et seq.*

[3] *Report of the International Polar Expedition to Point Barrow, Alaska* (1885), pp. 42-43; F. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1888 for 1884-1885), vi. 603-604.

[4] W. Bartram, "Observations on the Creek and Cherokee Indians," *Transactions of the American Ethnological Society* (1853), III. i. 78.

day of the first month of the year, anyone who is entering on a "critical year of his life," makes an effigy of straw, dresses it in his own clothes, casts it on the road, and then feasts all night. Whatever happens to the cast-out image is supposed to happen to the man's former self, now gone into the past, and "Fate is believed to look upon the individual clothes as another man."[1] "At the end of the year all the men of certain Zulu tribes procure a strong emetic which they swallow. No special reason is given for the custom, except that it 'clears away all the evil humours of the body.'"[2] On the same lines, a Dyak will change his name after recovering from a severe illness,[3] in the hope, as we may suppose, of thus getting rid of his former personality and its liability to disease.

In these examples of the common notion that a change of life best coincides with a new year, we see how the old personality is as far as possible cast away, and the new one put on with rejoicings. Certain climacteric seasons and biological crises in human life are also very natural periods for this impulse to show itself. One or two of these crises have been mentioned. In organised religions the practice is made the most of. [In Bali, after various proceedings to expel the evil spirits have been gone through, the priests curses them, which appears to finally dispose of them.][4] Periodic feasts amongst totemic peoples, at which the totem is eaten, are similar in intention. [On the other hand, the

[1] W. E. Griffis, *Corea* (1882), p. 298.

[2] J. Macdonald, "Manners, Customs, Superstitions, and Religions of South African Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1891), xx. 132.

[3] S. St John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East* (1862), i. 73; C. Hose, "The Natives of Borneo," *J.A.I* (1894), xxiii. 165.

[4] R. von Eck, "Schetsen van het eiland Bali," *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië* (1879), 4th ser., VIII. i. 58-60.

belief that a man's soul is reborn into an animal of his totem, often produces the opposite result, namely, a horror of eating one's totemic animal for fear of very literally absorbing new life. The belief of the Siena of the Ivory Coast is typical; they believe that on a man's death his soul passes into an animal of his totem, and this explains the horror with which the Siena regard the killing and eating of such an animal, since they would thus be consuming a late member of the tribe.][1] Periodic confession in Catholic countries introduces a periodic "turning of a new leaf." After child-birth mother and child are purified, and dressed in new garments; after menstruation the woman is cleansed; mourners put away their sorrow by newness of life. The prominence of food and feasting in some of these examples is a fact liable to be overlooked, but of great importance. It is not merely the new corn and wine brought out and used for the first time at some of these annual Saturnalia that is to be noted, though this is a particularly instructive case, but the use of any food, in these festivals and in others, at religious periods and biological crises, or even every day. The wine that "maketh glad the heart of man" and the bread that "strengthens man's heart" are naturally, as is to be gathered from the previous account of food-customs,[2] the best means of giving new life and strength. And in savage philosophy the laying-hold upon life and the preservation of strength, are the main duties of existence; it is so much more important than it is to us in an age where physical disabilities are so greatly reduced. We still use the phrase "to feel a new man" after a meal,

[1] M. Delafosse, "Le peuple Siéna ou Sénoufo," *Revue des Etudes Ethnographiques et Sociologiques* (1908), i. 452.

[2] [See above, i. 182 *et seq.*]

and to the savage the phrase is more of a reality, and we may conclude that on certain occasions, when circumstances were suitable, primitive man does thus feel that his personal identity is renewed by meat and drink.

During the initiation period the boys of many North American tribes, besides observing dietary regulations, took a violent emetic at regular intervals, [as among the Thompson Indians, during whose puberty ceremonies the boys had to live apart in solitude for certain periods; during these intervals such a boy "fasted, sometimes for many days, and cleansed himself by the use of purges, emetics and the sweat-bath."][1] This is a practical way of getting rid of one's original personal substance, and it has to be brought into connection with the common taboos upon various foods at and before puberty, removed when the boy is initiate and able to receive them. The intention of building up the lad's strength is expressly stated in many such cases. At the Seminole New Year festival, the "black drink" was drunk, and war-medicine taken. The latter was also taken, as it is in so many lands, before a battle in order to inspire the warriors with strength and courage.[2] This "black drink" is the Seminole national beverage, and its excellent qualities have helped to bring out in everyday practice the idea of beginning afresh and acquiring new life and strength. "The Seminoles drank every morning a kind of tea called 'the black drink,' a decoction of the leaves of the

[1] J. Teit, "The Thompson Indians of British Columbia," *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition* (1898-1900), i. 320. Cp. Sir J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy* (1910), iii. 402, 414, 419, 423, 429, 432; iv, 313.

[2] [C. MacCauley, "The Seminole Indians of Florida," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1887 for 1883-1884), v. 522-523.]

Cassine bush. It is slightly exhilarating, and the drinking of it was considered a solemn ceremonial act; it was supposed that it had a purifying effect upon their life, and effaced from their minds all the wrongs and injustice they had committed, that it possessed the power of imparting courage to the warrior and of rendering him invincible, and that it had a tendency of binding closer the ties of friendship."[1] The Masai and Wa-kwafi are the most practical beef-eaters in the world. A man will sit all day by a bullock gorging himself with its meat, in order to strengthen himself for battle.[2] Amongst the Zulus at the opening of the new year with the feast of first-fruits the men are "doctored" in order "to make them strong, healthy, and prosperous for the coming year."[3]

During and after sickness, again, the system is built up by new food. In Tasmania, a sick man was given human blood to drink.[4] The Zulus give sick persons the gall of a he-goat.[5] The Beni-Amer cure their sick by bathing them in the blood of a girl or of some animal. The blood of a goat is thus poured over a man's head and body.[6] Such cases often correlate with the idea of a substitute and with the common double idea, as in the Mithraic *taurobolium*, that blood both washes away sins and gives ghostly strength. On this principle the Zulus once a year kill a bull, the strength of which, "is supposed to enter into the king, thereby prolonging his life and strength. In some tribes a

[1] A. Featherman, *Social History of the Races of Mankind* (1885-1891), iii. 171.
[2] J. Thomson, *Through Masai Land* (1887), p. 264.
[3] L. Grout, *Zulu-land* [1864 ?], p. 161.
[4] J. Bonwick, *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians* (1870), p. 89.
[5] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu* (1868-1870), pp. 368, 372.
[6] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien* (1864), p. 310.

chief on his accession is washed in the blood of some near relative, who is put to death for the purpose."[1] In Tonga, human victims were slain to deter angry gods from destroying the king.[2]

The universal desire for representatives and substitutes, due partly to irresponsibility and partly to convenience, may be referred to here in a few examples. Amongst the Motu, to ensure a good harvest some leading man becomes *helega*, taboo.[3] In Shoa, to save the king's life, an animal is led round his bed and then slaughtered.[4] In Chrysee a straw man is burned as a substitute when any one is ill.[5] The Arabian custom of killing a sheep at a birth is explained by them "as averting evil from the child by shedding blood on its behalf."[6] The Acaxées before taking the war-path select a maiden of the tribe, who secludes herself during the whole period of the campaign, speaking to no one, and eating nothing but a little parched corn without salt.[7] The practice is common with kings as the representatives of their people. Thus the Mikado had to sit on the throne for some hours every morning, with his crown on, motionless, so as to preserve peace and tranquillity in the empire.[8]

Again, purification is ended on all occasions by taking food, or otherwise assimilating new strength. The link

[1] D. Leslie, *Among the Zulus and Amatongas* (1875), p. 91 ; J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), p. 216.

[2] S. S. Farmer, *Tonga and the Friendly Islands* (1855), p. 53.

[3] J. Chalmers, *Pioneering in New Guinea* (1887), p. 181.

[4] Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), iii. 385.

[5] A. R. Colquhoun, *Across Chrysé* (1883), p. 384.

[6] W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* (1885), pp. 153-154.

[7] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America* (1875-1876), i. 581.

[8] E. Kaempfer, *The History of Japan* (1727), i. 150.

between this and "washing off" the past, whether "contagion" or "sin," is seen in cases like this: sextons and mourners alike are "purified" amongst the Zulus from the "uncleanness" by being sprinkled with the gall of an animal sacrificed, or by drinking fresh milk.[1] After expelling all disease and ills, the Incas rubbed themselves with a paste of blood, to take away all weakness and infirmity.[2] The gall and the blood, of course, induce new strength into the system.

New clothes form another method of starting afresh; a man feels more or less "new" when wearing a new dress, and this universal practice on great occasions of feasting, ceremonies and marriage has this idea behind it. The link between washing, "purification," and new garments is made by such early toilet-practices as anointing the body with oil, fat and paint. The "purification" of a Kaffir woman after child-birth is completed by smearing her with fat and red clay.[3] For her this is a renewal of "decent apparel."

We have thus traced the passage of disguise into change, and of change into newness of life; in the next place change passes into exchange, exchange of identity, with the same ideas behind the practice. The idea of a disguise is often latent in this, but seldom emerges, for it is fused with more important aims. It may be discerned in this account of the notorious Feast of Fools, an account which may be here placed first, as this exchanging of identity is most prominent in festivals of the Saturnalia type. "The priests of a church elected a bishop of fools, who came in full pomp, placing himself in the episcopal

[1] J. Shooter, *op. cit.*, pp. 241, 247.

[2] Garcilasso de la Vega, *First Part of the Royal Commentaries of the Yncas* (1869-1871), ii. 228 *et seq.*

[3] J. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (1858), p. 94.

seat in the choir. High mass then begun; all the ecclesiastics assisted, their faces smeared with blacking, or covered with a hideous or ridiculous mask. During the course of the celebration, some of them, dressed like mountebanks or in women's clothes, danced in the middle of the choir, singing clownish or obscene songs. Others ate sausages or puddings from the altar, played at cards or at dice in front of the officiating priest, incensed him with the censer, or, burning old shoes, made him breathe the smoke."[1] This festival took place at Christmas. Similar practices were followed in the carnival on Shrove Tuesday, at which men dressed up as women and women as men,[2] [and, as we have seen,[3] the same was done even by children]. The idea is also latent in an ancient Argive festival, the Ὑβριστικά, held every year, at which women dressed in men's garments, and men in women's robes and veils;[4] and also in many Saturnalian festivals, such as the Saturnalia of ancient Rome, at which slaves exchanged position and dress with their masters, and men with women.[5] [In many English hotels "at the present day it is the custom at Christmas for the visitors and servants to change places."[6] A similar Indian feast, as celebrated by the Hos of Chota Nagpur, is described as "a Saturnalia, during which servants forget their duty to their masters, children their reverence for parents, men their respect for

[1] J. A. Dulaure, *Des divinités génératrices* (1905), p. 266. [Cp. E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage* (1903), i. 294.]

[2] J. Brand, *Popular Antiquities of Great Britain* (1849), i. 36, 66.

[3] [Above, i. 321.]

[4] Plutarch, *Mulierum virtutes*, 245 E.

[5] [L. C. Dezobry, *Rome au Siècle d'Auguste* (1870), iii. 143 *et seq.*]

[6] A. E. Crawley, "Orgy," *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (1917), ix. 558, col. 1, note 1. Cp. E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1921), i. 78 *et seq.*

women, and women all notions of modesty, delicacy, and gentleness. . . . Sons and daughters revile their parents in gross language, and parents their children ; men and women become almost like animals in the indulgence of their amorous propensities."][1]

These cases are explained by the Zulu custom, according to which, to avert a cattle plague, the girls herd the cattle for a day.[2] The idea is to change the luck by an exchange, which emphasises the interval thus placed between the old state and the new. So in New South Wales wives are exchanged, not only for reconciliation, but to escape some calamity.[3] The tribes on the Murray River practised temporary exchange of wives "in order to avert some great trouble which they fancied was coming ; for instance, they heard once that a great sickness was coming down the Murray, and the cunning old men proposed to each other that they should exchange wives to ensure safety from it."[4] It is a simple method, but actually it has been interpreted as a proof of primitive promiscuity. A detail used to corroborate the interpretation is that the old men thought it necessary to revert to "the old customs of the tribe" ; but the old custom to which they returned was surely this temporary exchange of wives, not promiscuity. The suggestion proves too much. The sexual licence of the *Nanga* in Fiji was practised when any person fell ill.[5] The Kurnai, when alarmed by the appearance of an *Aurora*

[1] F. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (1872), pp. 196-197.

[2] [E. G. Carbutt, "Some Minor Superstitions and Customs of the Zulus," *Folk-Lore Journal* (Cape Town, 1880), ii. 12-13.]

[3] A. L. P. Cameron, "Notes on some Tribes of New South Wales," *J.A.I.* (1885), xiv. 353.

[4] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), p. 290.

[5] L. Fison, "The Nanga, or Sacred Stone Enclosure, of Wainimala, Fiji," *J.A.I.* (1885), xiv. 28.

Australis, tried to send it away by magic, and also exchanged wives.[1] An Eskimo prescription for sickness is exchange of wives; if a child is ill, it changes its parents.[2]

The chief ideas in these ceremonial practices of exchange, whether of wives or other possessions, are, primarily, the wish for a preliminary interval before starting a new life, a sort of *vitai pausa* or artificial gulf between the old and the new, while there is implicit in the exchange an act of disguise; and secondarily, a desire for union with one's fellows, which is actually effected by exchange of identity. The latter, it will be noticed, is identical with union, and is the final principle of contact seen in the relation of *ngia ngiampe*. We saw[3] that the "black drink" of the Seminoles has the property of uniting hearts, and the human expressions of mutual friendliness by eating and drinking together has been fully described.[4] This explains the characteristic feature in festivities of the type of the Saturnalia, held once a year as a rule, and conceived as a means of starting life afresh. The wild pranks and general misbehaviour often associated with these festivals are doubtless to a great extent the expression of rejoicing at putting away the troubles of the past, but there is a method in the madness, a psychological reason behind it. Restraints are indeed broken, but the breaking of them is, first, a break with the old life, and, secondly, a method of union, not merely the result of over-feeding and excessive drinking. Take the case of the so-called promiscuous intercourse often found on these occasions;

[1] A. W. Howitt, "Some Australian Beliefs," *J.A.I.* (1884), xiii. 189.

[2] F. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (1888 for 1884-1885), vi. 593.

[3] [Above, i. 330-331.]

[4] [Above, i. 289 *et seq.*]

it is exactly parallel to the exchange of wives already noted.[1] Each is the expression of a desire for union with one's fellows. The very fact that the lending of wives is frequent as an act of hospitality connects the principles together. Hospitality is a close form of union. Exchange of wives, of dress, of names, of positions, or of anything belonging to a man, alike produces union. This secondary result of the common practice of men and women dressing up in the garments of the other sex, followed in Alsace at vintage festivals,[2] and on many similar occasions elsewhere, is that the two sexes are united, just as they were united in theory and in practice in the so-called licence used on such occasions. As showing how assimilation in dress and the like is a form of the desire for union, the following case is instructive. At a dance of girls amongst the Rejangs several young men were observed to show excitement. At last they joined in the dance; and the postures they assumed were quite similar to those of the maidens. "It is on such occasions that marriage contracts are generally made."[3] This impulse towards assimilation is seen now when 'Arry and 'Arriet exchange hats. Similar methods of effecting union by contact are also brought back to one physiological impulse, by comparing with them the Eskimo method of salutation. They do this by licking each other's hands, and then drawing them over their own faces and bodies first, and afterwards over the face and body of the other.[4]

[1] [Above, i. 296-297.]

[2] W. Mannhardt, *Wald- und Feldkulte: Der Baumkultus der Germanen und ihrer Nachbarstämme* (1875), i. 314.

[3] A. S. Bickmore, *Travels in the East Indian Archipelago* (1868), p. 496.

[4] F. W. Beechey, *Narrative of a Voyage to the Pacific and Beering's Straits* (1831), i. 391.

[This brings us to a subject, the kiss, which, using the term in its widest sense as one of the most intimate forms of contact, and as one of the most general forms of exchange in the category which we are now considering, and as being of great importance to our study in many respects, deserves detailed consideration.[1]

"A refinement of general bodily contact, the instinct to which is irreducible, kissing supplies a case, in the higher levels of physiological psychology, of the meeting and interaction of the two complementary primal impulses, hunger and love. It is remarkable that, although the act in its civilised form is very rare among the lower and semi-civilised races, it is fully established as instinctive in the higher societies. This is a case of an acquired character or of some corresponding process. Equally remarkable is the fact that a line can be drawn between the higher civilisations; thus, the kiss seems to have been unknown to ancient Egypt; in early Greece and Assyria it was firmly established, and probably its development in India was as early as the Aryan age.

"Touch is 'the mother of the senses' and the kiss may be referred generally to a tactile basis, as a specialised form of contact. Animal life provides numerous analogies; the billing of birds, the cataglottism of pigeons and the antennal play of some insects, are typical cases. Among the higher animals, such as the bear and the dog, there is a development which seems to lead up to those forms of the act most prevalent among the lower races of man and also characteristic of the peoples of Eastern Asia. Far more similar, however, to the civilised human kiss and the non-olfactory forms of the savage kiss is the

[1] The following excursus on the subject of the kiss is a reproduction, with a few trifling omissions and alterations, of an article by Mr Crawley, "Kissing," in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (1914), vii. 739-744.

habit attested for cats of pressing or squeezing one another's nose.[1]

"The lower types of the kiss are incorrectly grouped by travellers under the term 'rubbing noses,' and various forms are often confused. The olfactory form occasionally includes mutual contact with the nose, as among the Maoris, Society and Sandwich Islanders, the Tongans, the Eskimos, and most of the Malayan races. The rubbing of noses, often styled 'the Malay kiss,' is described by Darwin thus: the giver of the kiss places his nose at right angles on the nose of the other, and then rubs it; the process occupies no longer than a handshake among Europeans. Cook and others describe the South Sea Islands form as a vigorous mutual rubbing with the end of the nose, omitting the olfactory element.[2] Elsewhere, as among the Australians, general contact of the face occurs, that is, 'face-rubbing.'[3] In many lower races mothers lick their infants. But the typical primitive kiss is contact of nose and cheek; the Khyoungtha, for instance, apply mouth and nose to the cheek, and then inhale.[4] Among the Chinese, Yakuts and various Mongolian peoples, and even the Lapps of Europe, this method is characteristic, and is thus described by d'Enjoy: the nose is pressed on the cheek, a nasal inspiration follows, during which the eyelids are lowered; lastly, there is a smacking of the lips. The three phases are clearly distinguished.[5] It is remarkable that this Eastern Asiastic

[1] H. Gaidoz, *quoted by* C. Myrop, *The Kiss and its History* (1901), p. 180.

[2] Sir E. B. Tylor, "Salutations," *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1911), xxiv. 94; H. L. Roth, "On Salutations," *J.A.I.* (1890), xix. 166; G. Turner, *Samoa a Hundred Years Ago and long before* (1884), p. 179; C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

[3] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), iii. 176.

[4] T. H. Lewin, *Wild Races of South-Eastern India* (1870), p. 118.

[5] P. d'Enjoy, "Le baiser en Europe et en Chine," *Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris* (1897), 4th ser., viii. 181-185.

method, typically primitive, should be retained by Chinese civilisation. The Japanese have no word for kiss, and the act is known only between mother and child.

"The European kiss consists essentially in the application of the lips to some part of the face, head or body, or to the lips, of the other person. Normally there is no [conscious] olfactory element, and any tactile use of the nose is absolutely unknown. It is thus a distinct species, and to describe it as having been evolved from the savage form is erroneous. As a racial habit, it distinguishes the European peoples and their cultural or racial ancestry, the Teutons, the Graeco-Romans and the Semites, but it appears to have been unknown to the Celts.

"As for its physiological derivation, we have excluded certain elements. Nyrop refers it to taste and smell;[1] Tylor describes it as a 'salute by tasting,'[2] d'Enjoy as 'a bite and a suction.'[3] Each of these definitions is untenable. Though popular metaphor inevitably speaks of taste, and even of eating and drinking, there is nothing gustatory in the kiss. Such suction as may be ascribed to it is merely the mechanical closing of the lips,[4] as in speaking and eating. This may be described as a refinement of biting, but it would be misleading. Similarly in abnormal forms some use of the tongue occurs. But no connection with the bite can be maintained, except in the sense to be explained below. It is true that playful biting with the teeth is practised by savage mothers, and among various peoples by passionate lovers, but there is no derivative connection between this and the kiss proper.

[1] C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, p. 185. [2] Sir E. B. Tylor, *op. cit.*, xxiv. 94.

[3] P. d'Enjoy, *op. cit.*, viii. 184.

[4] *A New English Dictionary* (1901), V. ii. 714, defines kissing thus: "To press or touch with the lips (at the same time compressing and then separating them) . . ."

The suggestion has been made that the kiss is practically a mode of speech. Emphasis is here laid on the weak or fond sound which often accompanies the so-called 'sucking movement' of the muscles of the lips; this 'inspiratory bilabial sound' is compared to the lip-click of many barbarous languages.[1] The suggestion does not go far; the element of truth is the fact that the kiss, like language, is a refinement of the nutritive processes of the mouth.

"The kiss is a special case of tactile sensory pleasure. In it the lips, the skin of which is the very sensitive variety between the ordinary cuticle and mucous membrane, are alone concerned. The movement made is the initial movement of the process of eating. There is, no doubt, a true psychological nexus between affection and hunger, which is no less truly expressed in the mechanism of the kiss. The act is a secondary habit of the lips, just as speech is a secondary habit of the whole oral mechanism. The intimate connection between the development of language and the masticatory processes of man has been brought out by E. J. Payne.[2] The kiss, therefore, is not to be referred to the bite, or even to gustation, much less to mastication, suction or olfactory processes. The primary movement of the lips is simply transferred to a metaphorical use, so to say, and their sensitiveness is applied to a secondary object, whose stimulus is not hunger, but the analogous emotions of love, affection and veneration.

"Lombroso has argued that the kiss of lovers is derived from the maternal kiss.[3] It is true that the

[1] C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

[2] *History of the New World called America* (1892-1899), ii. 144.

[3] C. Lombroso, *cited by* H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1905), iv. 218.

latter is sometimes found among peoples who do not practice the former. The Japanese, for instance, are ignorant of the kiss, except as applied by a mother to her infant.[1] In Africa and other uncivilised regions it is a common observation of travellers that husbands and wives, and lovers, do not kiss. But all mothers seem to caress and fondle their children. Winwood Reade has described the horror shown by a young African girl when he kissed her in the European fashion.[2] The argument, however, of Lombroso is of the same order as that which derives sexual love from maternal, and in neither case can there be any derivation, precisely because the subject during adolescence comes into a new physical and psychological environment, which itself is sufficient to explain a new reaction.

"Some variations in the kiss proper (which we identify with the European) may be here noted. The kiss of North American Indian women is described as consisting in laying the lips softly on the cheek, no sound or motion being made.[3] This would not come under the Chinese criticism of the European kiss as being voracious.[4] When Australian or negro women are mentioned as employing the kiss,[5] we may assume that it is of the olfactory variety. The former people have one branch, the North Queensland tribes, where the kiss is well developed. It is used between mother and child, and between husband and wife. In contrast with many early languages, the pitta-pitta dialect has a word for kissing.[6]

[1] Lafcadio Hearn, "*Out of the East*" (1895), p. 103.

[2] W. W. Reade, *Savage Africa* (1863), p. 193.

[3] E. B. Custer, *Boots and Saddles* (1885), p. 213.

[4] P. d'Enjoy, *op. cit.*, viii. 184.

[5] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), i. 343; W. E. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines* (1897), p. 184.

[6] W. E. Roth, *loc. cit.*

As for distinctions in the civilised Western kiss, that of the ancient Romans still applies, though modern languages do not employ three terms for the three forms. In Latin, *osculum* was the kiss on the face or cheeks, as used between friends ; *basium* was the kiss of affection, made with and on the lips ; *suavium* (or *savium*) was the kiss between the lips, confined to lovers alone. The modern French retain, and other continental peoples (to some extent the English also) follow them, the distinction between the kiss on the cheek and the kiss on the mouth, the latter being reserved for lovers. Both in social custom and in literature the erotic symbolism of the lovers' kissed has assumed a remarkable importance among the French, who regard a kiss on the mouth, except in cases of love, as a real social sin.

"Turning to the social history of the practice, though kissing is said to be unknown among the Japanese prior to European influence, among the Indians of Guiana, the ancient Celtic peoples and the ancient Egyptians, each statement is probably too dogmatic. The general conclusion is that the habit in some form or another has been prevalent since primitive times, and has received its chief development in Western culture.

"Among the Greeks and Latins parents kissed their children, lovers and married persons kissed one another, and so did friends of the same sex or of different sexes.[1] The kiss was used in various religious and ceremonial acts. Very similar was the Hebrew practice,[2] with the exception that kissing between persons of different sex was discountenanced, though a male cousin might kiss a

[1] Sir E. B. Tylor, *op. cit.*, xxiv. 94 ; H. H. Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 7. Under the early Empire the practice assumed remarkable forms in social intercourse ; it was fashionable, for instance, to perfume the mouth.

[2] A. Grieve, "Kiss," *The Dictionary of the Bible* (1900), iii. 5.

female cousin. The Rabbis advised that all such kisses should be avoided, as leading to lewdness, and restricted the kiss to greeting, farewell and respect.[1] In Semitic life also there was more use of the ceremonial kiss than among the Greeks and Romans.

"The early Christian habit of promiscuous kissing as a symbol of fellowship was an application of pagan social practice, and there are grounds for supposing that it offended the Hebrew element as it certainly shocked the Jewish Church.[2] This is St Peter's 'kiss of charity';[3] and St Paul frequently writes: 'Salute one another with an holy kiss.'[4] It possessed a sacramental value. 'The primitive usage was for the "holy kiss" to be given promiscuously, without any restriction as to sexes or ranks, among those who were all one in Christ Jesus.'[5] Later, owing to scandals, or rather to such feeling as Tertullian mentions,[6] the practice was limited, and it was ordered that men of the laity should salute men, and women women, separately.[7]

"The classical practice, rendered slightly more free by the early Christian extension, prevailed throughout the Middle Ages, with the curious detail that English women had more liberty than continental ones in kissing male friends. Erasmus in a famous passage describes the freedom possessed in this matter by English girls.[8] In

[1] J. Jacobs, "Kiss and Kissing," *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (1925), vii. 516; C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

[2] T. K. Cheyne, "Salutations," *Encyclopædia Biblica* (1903), iv. column 4254.

[3] 1 *Peter*, v. 14.

[4] *Romans*, xvi. 16; 1 *Corinthians*, xvi. 20; 1 *Thessalonians*, v. 26.

[5] E. Venables, "Kiss," *A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (1880), ii. 902.

[6] *Ad uxorem*, ii. 4. A pagan husband was reluctant that his Christian wife should greet one of the brethren with a kiss.

[7] *Apostolic Constitutions*, ii. 57, viii. 11.

[8] D. Erasmus, *The Epistles* (1901), pp. 203-204.

Catholic ritual the kiss dwindled to more or less of a survival. In court ceremonial it persisted with other details of etiquette; and the same was the case with certain ecclesiastical and legal formalities. Knights after being dubbed, persons elected to office, and brides on marriage were kissed.[1] After the Renaissance a change appeared in England, and kissing became more and more restricted to parental and sexual relations. Thus, Congreve writes at the end of the seventeenth century: 'You think you're in the Country, where great lubberly Brothers slabber and kiss one another when they meet, like a Call of Serjeants—'Tis not the fashion here. . . .'[2] At the same time the practice of kissing between friends of different sex, other than lovers and relatives by birth or marriage, fell out of use. It had done so in France a century earlier, and the restriction was copied by English society.[3] Increasing moral refinement, or perhaps the increase of restrictions necessitated by an extension of individualism, may be assigned as a cause.

"In modern social life the kiss is confined to lovers, members of the family, and women-friends. Between fathers and sons it does not survive adolescence. In continental countries it still persists, especially in France, between male friends, and this fashion is preserved between sovereigns. The courtly use of kissing a lady's hand as a mark of respect came from the court life of Renaissance times. It is obsolete in common life, but clings to the etiquette of great personages. As already stated, the distinction is carefully preserved among continental peoples between the kiss of affection and the kiss of affianced love.

[1] C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, pp. 163-164.

[2] W. Congreve, *The Way of the World* (1700), Act III, p. 46.

[3] H. H. Ellis, *op. cit.*, iv. 7.

"The social and religious usages of the kiss are many. In the etiquette, natural or artificial, of salutation, the kiss is a central point, where the relations involve tenderness or veneration, or where these emotions are supposed. Its importance is illustrated by various facts of language. The 'embrace' and the 'salute' are [in use] synonymous with it. Where the act is obsolete, language preserves its memory. The Spaniard says, 'I kiss your hands'; the Austrian describes an ordinary salutation by the phrase 'Küss d'Hand.'[1]

"According to Rabbi Aḳiba, the Medes kissed the hand only.[2] Odysseus, on his return, was kissed by his friends on the head, hands and shoulders.[3] In Greece generally inferiors kissed the hand, breast or knee of superiors.[4] In Persia equals in rank kissed each other on the mouth, and those slightly unequal on the cheek, while one much inferior in rank prostrated himself.[5] Esau 'fell on the neck' of Jacob and kissed him.[6] Among the Hebrews the cheek, forehead, beard, hands and feet were kissed; some deny the practice of kissing on the lips. The phrase in the *Song of Songs*[7] does not prove its existence, but there is no *a priori* reason against it in the case of the lover's kiss.[8] The customary kiss in modern Palestine is thus described: 'Each, in turn, places his head, face downwards, upon the other's left shoulder, and afterwards kisses him upon the right cheek, and then reverses the action, by placing his head similarly upon the other's right shoulder and kissing him upon

[1] Sir E. B. Tylor, "Salutations," *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1911), xxiv. 95.

[2] *Talmud: Zĕrā'īm: Bĕrākhōth*, 8*b*.

[3] Homer, *Odyssey*, xxi. 224.

[4] Sir E. B. Tylor, *op. cit.*, xxiv. 95.

[5] Herodotus, *History*, i. 134.

[6] *Genesis*, xxxiii. 4; cp. xlv. 14.

[7] [*The Song of Songs*, i. 2: "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth."]

[8] T. K. Cheyne, "Salutations," *Encyclopædia Biblica* (1903), iv. column 4254, denies the kiss on the mouth in *Genesis*, xli. 40, *Proverbs*, xxiv. 26.

the left cheek. . . . When a kindly, but somewhat more formal and respectful, salutation passes between those of the same rank, they will take hold of each other's beards and kiss them. Women also greet their husbands, and children their fathers, in like manner. . . . The salutation which passes in polite society between a host and those of his guests who are in a similar station of life, consists in placing the right hand upon the other's left shoulder and kissing his right cheek, and then laying the left hand on his right shoulder and kissing his left cheek. . . . There is another more formal mode of salutation between those of similar station of life when meeting in the ordinary way. In this case they join their right hands, simply placing them one to the other, and then each kisses his own hand and puts it to his lips and forehead, sometimes to his forehead only, or over his heart, and at others over his heart, merely, without kissing it.'[1] It has been suggested that, when Absalom to gain popularity kissed the people, he employed the second form.[2]

"Equals saluted one another on the cheek or head; so Samuel saluted Saul.[3] Inferiors kissed the hands of superiors. If, in the betrayal of Jesus, Judas kissed his Master on the face, it was an act of presumption.[4] The fact that the kiss was passed over without remark seems to show that it was, as it should have been from disciple to master, a kiss on the hand. The Prodigal Son would kiss his father's hands before being embraced and kissed.[5] Inferiors also kissed the feet (as the woman 'who was a

[1] J. Neil, *Kissing: its Curious Bible Mentions* (1865), pp. 37-41.

[2] 2 *Samuel*, xv. 5; J. Neil, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

[3] 1 *Samuel*, x. 1.

[4] *Luke*, xxii. 47-48; G. M. Mackie, "Kiss," *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (1906), i. 935; T. K. Cheyne, *op. cit.*, iv. column 4254.

[5] *Luke*, xv. 20.

sinner,'[1] and would-be borrowers),[2] or, again, the 'hem of the garment.'[3] Vassals, in the Assyrian inscriptions, show submission by kissing the monarch's feet. Similar homage may be assigned to the phrase, 'Kiss the Son.'[4] As an act of piety, the Pharisees practised kissing the feet, as did the pious generally.[5] The humiliation of the symbolic act of Christ in kissing the disciples' feet has been preserved till recent times by some religious orders, and even by European monarchs. The foot of the pope is kissed in ceremonial audiences. By the year A.D. 847 it was said to be an ancient usage. There are grounds for supposing it to be derived from a usage in the Emperor-worship of Rome.[6] Prostration is an instinctive expression of fear, awe or adoration; to clasp the knees, as was the custom with Greek suppliants, is equally instinctive. The act of kissing the feet is a refinement of these. The *Old Testament* phrase 'licking the dust,'[7] is equally doubtfully referred to the kiss upon the feet. In ancient India it was a familiar salutation of respect.[8] The feudalistic aspect of the little court held by the old Roman *patronus* is illustrated by Martial's epigram, which complains of the burdensome civility of the kisses of clients.[9] In the court ceremonial of medieval and modern Europe, the kiss on the cheek obtains between sovereigns; subjects kiss the sovereign's hand. In medieval Europe the vassal thus salutes the lord, while it was not unusual to kiss a bishop's hand.[10] In modern

[1] *Luke*, vii. 45. [2] *Sirach*, xxix. 5. [3] *Matthew*, ix. 20, xiv. 36.

[4] *Psalms*, ii. 12. [5] *Talmud: Nězikin: Baba Bathra*, 16*a*.

[6] Said to have been instituted by Diocletian; H. Thurston, "Kiss," *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1910), viii. 665.

[7] *Psalms*, lxxii. 9; *Isaiah*, xlix. 23; *Micah*, vii. 17.

[8] Gautama, *Institutes of the Sacred Law*, ii. 32-33.

[9] Martial, *Epigrams*, xii. 59.

[10] J. Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ* (1838-1840), i. 128-129.

Europe a kiss conveying blessing or reverence is usually on the forehead. 'In Morocco equals salute each other by joining their hands with a quick motion, separating them immediately, and kissing each his own hand.'[1] The Turk kisses his own hand, and then places it on his forehead. The Arab kisses his hand to the storm.[2] Such is the gesture of adoration to sun and moon referred to in the *Old Testament*,[3] and also used by the Greeks to the sun.[4] It was the Greek and Roman method of adoration. In explanation of the gesture, Oriental folklore agrees with the European in identifying life or soul with the breath. More exactly, the thrown kiss is a symbolic act, transferring to an object at a distance merely the essence of the kiss.

"The kiss in its legal aspect is a natural application of the ideas which produced hand-shaking and similar modes of contact. Medieval knights kissed, as modern boxers shake hands, before the encounter. Reconciled foes kiss as a sign of peace.[5] It was specially in connection with marriage that the kiss *osclum*, *oscle*, was prominent. *Osclum* was a synonym generally for *pactum*; *osculata pax* was a peace confirmed by a kiss; *osclare* meant *dotare*; and *osculum interveniens* was a term applied to gifts between engaged persons. If one of them died before marriage, the presents were returned should no kiss have been given at the betrothal.[6] It is significant that the kiss was symbolical of marriage as 'initium consummationis nuptiarum.' In old French and medieval law generally the term *oscle* was applied to the

[1] E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), ii. 151.

[2] C. M. Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta* (1888), ii. 67.

[3] *Job*, xxxi. 26-28. [4] Lucian, *De saltatione*, 17.

[5] C. Nyrop, *The Kiss and its History* (1901), pp. 107-108.

[6] J. Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ* (1838-1840), vii. 321-322.

principle that a married woman kissing or being kissed by another man than her husband was guilty of adultery.[1]

"Besides the permanent objects of the kiss, in family and analogous relations, the relations of superior and inferior, lord and vassal, sovereign and subject, there are many others which, with more or less permanence, have claimed the kiss as a religious service. It is very significant of the affectionate element in religion that the kiss should have played so large a part in its ritual. The meeting-point between the social and the religious aspects of the kiss is perhaps to be found in the application of the salute to saints and religious heroes. Thus, Joseph kissed Jacob,[2] and his disciples kissed Paul.[3] Joseph kissed his dead father,[4] and the custom is retained in our civilisation of imprinting a farewell kiss on dead relatives. To suggest, however, that the act of Joseph proves the worship of Jacob as a divine being is against psychology.[5] All that can be said is that so fine a human sentiment is on the border-line between social and religious feeling. In medieval Europe there was a similar feeling about the kiss of state. This is shown by the instances of Henry II and St Thomas of Canterbury, and of Richard I and St Hugh.[6] Similarly in social life generally ; it is said that among the Welsh the kiss was used only on special occasions, and a husband could put away his wife for kissing another man, however innocently.[7] The early Christians exploited the social value of the kiss. Though in strong contrast to the Welsh custom, this is equally sacramental. It has been argued that the ritualistic 'kiss

[1] C. Du Fresne Du Cange, *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ latinitatis* (1883-1887), *s.v.* "Osculum."

[2] *Genesis*, l. 1. [3] *Acts*, xx. 37. [4] *Genesis*, l. 1.

[5] J. Jacobs, "Kiss and Kissing," *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (1925), vii. 516.

[6] H. Thurston, "Kiss," *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1910), viii. 665.

[7] H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1905), iv. 217.

of peace' alone obtained among the Christians, and that the social salute was not practised. But the evidence is strong enough to prove the latter custom.[1] For St Ambrose this was 'pietatis et caritatis pignus.'[2] The custom involved a peculiar sentiment, if we consider it in connection with the Christian ideal and practice of love, in which passion was encouraged, though chastity was enforced.

"In the early church the baptised were kissed by the celebrant after the cermony.[3] Roman Catholic ritual still includes the kiss bestowed on the newly ordained by the bishop. The bishop on consecration and the king when crowned receive the kiss. The kiss bestowed on penitents after absolution was connected with the kiss received by the Prodigal Son. The practice of giving a farewell kiss to the dead is probably connected with the old Italian rite of receiving the soul of the dying in his last breath. In the sixth century the Council of Auxerre (A.D. 578) prohibited the kissing of the dead.[4] Penitents were enjoined to kiss sacred objects.[5]

"First mentioned in the second century by Justin,[6] the kiss of peace was one of the most distinctive elements in the Christian ritual. To Clement of Alexandria it was a 'mystery.'[7] The εἰρήνη was a preliminary rite in the primitive mass. Conybeare has suggested that

[1] H. Thurston, *loc. cit.* [2] St Ambrose, *Hexæmeron*, VI. ix. 68.

[3] Cyprian, *Ad Fidum de infantibus baptizandis*, 4. Similarly in lower stages of culture, a girl after initiation is kissed by her female kin; see J. Macdonald, "Manners, Customs, Superstitions, and Religions of South African Tribes," *J.A.I.* (1891), xx. 118.

[4] H. Thurston, *op. cit.*, viii. 665.

[5] C. Du Fresne Du Cange, *op. cit.*, *s.v.* "Adoratio horarum."

[6] Justin Martyr, *Apologiæ*, i. 65.

[7] Among the terms used are εἰρήνη, *pax*, *osculum pacis*, *osculum sanctum*, φίλημα ἅγιον, φίλημα ἀγάπης; the last three, together with ἀσπασμός, *salutatio*, show its general identity with the Christian social kiss.

it was derived from an institution of the synagogue.[1] Philo speaks of a 'kiss of harmony' like that between the elements; the Word of God brings hostile things together in concord and the kiss of love.[2] However that may be, the *pax* became a feature of both Western and Eastern ritual, more conspicuously in the former. St Cyril writes: 'This kiss is the sign that our souls are united, and that we banish all remembrance of injury.'[3] This kiss seems to have been given at the beginning of the offertory, between the washing of hands and the *sursum corda*. But, later, the kiss was in close connection with the Communion. It has therefore been conjectured that the *pax* was twice given. In the modern Roman ritual it is given only at High Mass, and rarely to any of the congregation. The celebrant kisses the corporal, and presents his left cheek to the deacon, with the formula *pax tecum*, answered by *et cum spiritu tuo*. The deacon conveys the kiss to the sub-deacon, and he to the other clergy. In the Greek liturgy the celebrant says, 'Peace be to all,' and kisses the gifts, while the deacon kisses his own stole.[4] On Easter Sunday in the same Church the congregation kiss one another.[5]

"The fact that the Christians at the time of the younger Pliny were called upon, when arrested, to 'adore' the effigy of the Emperor was sufficient to emphasise the ritual importance of the kiss. *Adoratio*, that is, the act of carrying to the mouth, the Roman form of homage and worship, consisted in raising the right hand to the lips, kissing it, and then waving it in

[1] F. C. Conybeare, "New Testament Notes," *The Expositor* (1894), 4th ser., ix. 461.

[2] Philo, *Quaestiones in Exodum*, ii. 78, 118.

[3] St Cyril, *Catecheses*, xxiii, 3.

[4] H. Thurston, *op. cit.*, viii. 665.

[5] C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

the direction of the adored object,[1] after which the worshipper turned his body to the right.[2] During the ceremony the head was covered, except when Saturn or Hercules was adored. Plutarch suggests fantastic reasons for exceptional uses in which the worshipper turned from right to left.[3]

"But both Greeks and Romans employed the kiss direct in worship. Cicero observes that the lips and beard of the statue of Heracles at Agrigentum were almost worn away by the kisses of the devout.[4] The kiss indirect, or the kiss at a distance, may be described as a natural extension of the direct, capable of development by any people independently. But it is a curious fact that it can be traced from Græco-Roman civilisation to that of modern Europe, where, however, it appears to be instinctive in children. The adoration of the Roman Emperors was influenced by Oriental ceremonial. It consisted in bowing or kneeling, touching the robe, and putting the hand to the lips, or kissing the robe; a variation was the kissing of the feet or knees.[5] The kiss of homage in the Middle Ages was so important a part of the ceremony that *osculum* became a synonym for *homagium*.[6] The vassal kissed the lord's feet, very occasionally his thigh. Afterwards he offered a present for the privilege, a *baise-main*, a term which shows the connection or confusion with the equally prevalent fashion of kissing the hand of the sovereign. It is said that Rolf the Ganger, the first Duke of Normandy,

[1] Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, iv. 28.

[2] Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, xxviii. 25; *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum* (1853), iii. 804, no. 5980.

[3] Plutarch, *Numa*, 14.

[4] Cicero, *In Verrem*, IV. xliii. 94.

[5] A. S. Williams, "Adoratio," *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* (1890), i. 28-29.

[6] C. Du Fresne Du Cange, *op. cit.*, *s.v.* "Osculum."

when receiving the province as a fief from Charles the Simple, kissed the monarch's feet by lifting them to his mouth as he stood erect. When homage was paid in the lord's absence, the vassal kissed the door, lock or bolt of his castle ; this was *baiser l'huis* or *le verrouil.*[1]

" Rabbinical lore includes a unique fancy, explanatory of the death of the righteous. According to this, the death of a favourite of God is the result of a kiss from God. Such a death was the easiest of all, and was reserved for the most pious. Thus died Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Aaron, Moses and Miriam.[2] There is a legend that, as St Monica lay dying, a child kissed her on the breast, and the saint at once passed away. Italian folklore preserves the Hebrew idea in one of its phrases for death, 'Addormentarsi nel bacio del Signore,' 'To fall asleep in the lord's kiss.' The kiss of a ghost (in other folklore) produces death.[3]

" There is much evidence of beliefs connected with the kissing of sacred objects. Kissing the image of a god was a recognised rite of adoration among both Greeks and Romans. The early Arabs had the same rite ; on leaving and entering the house they kissed the house-gods.[4] In the Eleusinian Mysteries the sacred objects were kissed.[5] The toe of St Peter's statue is kissed by Roman Catholics. The Muslims kissed the Ka'ba at Mecca. In the wall there is a black stone believed by Muslims to be one of the stones of paradise. It was once white, but has been blackened by the kisses of

[1] C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-125.

[2] *Talmud : Zĕrā'īm · Bĕrākhōth*, 8*a* ; *Talmud : Nĕzikin : Baba Buthra*, 17*a* ; J. Jacobs, " Kiss and Kissing," *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (1925), vii. 516.

[3] C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, pp. 96, 171.

[4] J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums* (1887), p. 105.

[5] C. A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (1829), p. 135.

sinful but believing lips.[1] The Hebrews often lapsed into the idolatrous practice; Hosea speaks of 'kissing calves';[2] the image of Baal was kissed.[3] Together with kneeling, the kiss comprises belief and homage. The Hebrews kissed the floor of the Temple, and to this day it is the practice to kiss the *ṣîṣîth* of the *ṭallith* when putting it on, the *mezūzāh* at the door when entering or leaving, and the Scroll of the law when about to read or to bless it.[4] It is even customary among Jews, though not obligatory, when a Hebrew book is dropped to kiss it. 'Kissing the Book' is a case, surviving as a real living ceremony in the highest civilisation, of primitive conceptions of the oath. These were expressed in various forms.[5] One method of 'charging an oath with supernatural energy is to touch, or to establish some kind of contact with, a holy object on the occasion when the oath is taken.'[6] The view of Dr Westermarck that *mana* or *baraka* is thus imparted to the oath, is further developed when the name of a supernatural being is introduced; thus the modern English ceremony retains the words, 'so help me God.' A complementary aspect is supplied by forms whose object is to prevent perjury. The Angami Nāgas 'place the barrel of a gun, or a spear, between their teeth, signifying by this ceremony that, if they do not act up to their agreement, they are prepared to fall by either of the two weapons.'[7] In Tibetan law courts 'the great oath' is taken 'by the person placing a holy scripture on his

[1] E. H. Palmer, "Introduction [to the Qur'ân]," *Sacred Books of the East* (1880), vi. p. xiii.

[2] *Hosea*, xiii. 2. [3] 1 *Kings*, xix. 18. [4] J. Jacobs, *op. cit.*, vii. 516.

[5] Cp. E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1912-1917), ii. 118 *et seq.*

[6] *Ibid.*, ii. 119.

[7] J. Butler, *Travels and Adventures in the Province of Assam* (1855), p. 154.

head, and sitting on the reeking hide of an ox and eating a part of the ox's heart.'[1] Hindus swear on a copy of the Sanskrit *Harivaṁśa*.[2]

"The European ceremony of kissing the book of the New Testament after taking the oath in a law-court connects in its material form rather with the kiss of reverence, as instanced in the kissing of relics and sacred objects generally. But in essence there is still some of the primitive sense of responsibility by contact, rendered stronger by the invocation of the name of the deity. Derived indirectly from the Græco-Roman ritual of kissing of sacred objects and the Hebrew reverence for the Scroll of the Law, it was early developed by the Christians into their characteristic ceremony of oath-taking. Chrysostom writes: 'But do thou, if nothing else, at least reverence the very book thou holdest out to be sworn by, open the gospel thou takest in thy hands to administer the oath, and, hearing what Christ therein saith of oaths, tremble and desist.'[3] Ingeltrude is represented repeating the words: 'These four Evangelists of Christ our God which I hold in my own hand and kiss with my mouth.'[4] In the former quotation the act of kissing can only be inferred from the word 'reverence.' The holding of the book is less definite than the Hebrew rite of placing the hands on the scroll when swearing. Even in the Middle Ages an oath was often taken merely by laying the hand on the Missal.[5] The Lombards swore lesser oaths by consecrated

[1] L. A. Waddell, *The Buddhism of Tibet* (1895), p. 569 *n.*[1].

[2] E. Westermarck, *op cit.*, ii. 120.

[3] St Chrysostom, *Ad populum Antiochenum*, xv. 5.

[4] C. Du Fresne Du Cange, *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ latinitatis* (1883-1887), *s.v.* "Juramentum."

[5] C. Nyrop, *The Kiss and its History* (1901), p. 119.

weapons, the greater on the Gospels, but it is not certain whether they kissed the book.[1] An oath ratified by contact with a sacred object was a "corporal oath"; the object was the *halidome*, the equivalent of the Greek ὅρκος, oath and object being identified. No doubt contact by means of the lips was at an early date regarded as more efficacious than contact by means of the hand, and thus the more primitive notion was superimposed upon that of adoration. In Islam the rite is that usual in adoration and does not include the kiss.[2] In modern England a detail to be noted is that the hand holding the book must be ungloved. The book varies according to the creed: a Jew is sworn on the Old Testament and a Roman Catholic on the Douay Testament. The term 'book,' employed with special reference to the oath upon the New Testament, has been regular in England since the fourteenth century at least.[3]

"Among Anglican clergy, it is customary to kiss the cross of the stole before putting it on. The Catholic Church enjoins the duty of kissing relics, the Gospels, the Cross, consecrated candles and palms, the hands of the clergy and the vestments and utensils of the liturgy. It was formerly part of the Western use that the celebrant should kiss the host. He now kisses the corporal. The altar is regarded as typical of Christ, and as such is kissed by the celebrant.[4] In the Greek Church relics are kissed.

"The 'kiss of peace' was in medieval times the subject of a curious simplification of ritual, by which it

[1] C. Du Fresne Du Cange, *op. cit.*, *s.v.* "Juramentum."

[2] The right hand is placed on the *Koran* and the head is brought down touching the book.

[3] *A New English Dictionary* (1888), *s.v.* "Book," i. 989, quoting a document of 1389: "Eche of hem had sworen on þe bock."

[4] H. Thurston, "Kiss," *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1910), viii. 164.

became, as it were, a material object. In the 12th or 13th century, for reasons of convenience, the *instrumentum pacis* or *osculatorium*, was introduced.[1] This was a plaque of metal, ivory or wood, carved with various designs, and fitted with a handle. It was brought to the altar for the celebrant to kiss, and then to each of the congregation at the rails. This is the pax-board or pax-brede of the museums.[2]

"The metaphorical applications of the idea of the kiss are not numerous. In some phrases it expresses a light touch. Generally it implies close contact or absolute reconciliation or acquiescence ;[3] to kiss the dust is to be overthrown ; to kiss the rod is to submit to chastisement ; to kiss the cup is to drink. Folklore developed in interesting ways the connection between the emotional gesture and the ideas of magic and charms. Relics were kissed to regain health. Conversely, the kiss of a sacred person, a specialised form of his touch, cures the leper, as in the case of St Martin. Some similar association of thought may attach to the nursery practice of 'kissing the place to make it well,' gamesters used to kiss the cards in order to secure luck with them ; an Alpine peasant kissed his hand before receiving a present. Pages in the French Court kissed any article which they were given to carry. A famous instance of symbolism is the kiss bestowed by Brutus on his mother-earth—an application of the kiss of greeting. But in German folklore, to kiss the ground is to die.[4] The privilege in English folk-custom known as 'kissing under the mistletoe' is a Christmas practice connected by Sir James

[1] C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, p. 120.
[2] H. Thurston, *loc. cit.*
[3] Cp. *Psalms*, lxxxv. 10.
[4] C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, pp. 90, 121, 130 *et seq.*, 168.

Frazer with the licence of the Saturnalia.[1] Greek, Latin and Teutonic mythology employed the motive of unbinding a spell by a kiss—*le fier baiser* of Arthurian romance, which changes a dragon into the maiden who had been enchanted.[2] The Sleeping Beauty awakened by the kiss of a lover is a widely-distributed motif. An analogy, without actual derivation, is to be found in many primitive cases of cancelling a taboo. Thus in Australian ceremony, bodily contact, analogous to the kiss, in various forms, removes the taboo between two persons, such as the celebrant and the subject of a rite."

This lengthy survey illustrates by means of a detailed investigation of a single mode of contact the almost infinite possibilities of such contact, and brings us at last to our main theme, the breaking of taboo, to which we must now return.]

Again, all taboos are removed for a while to form an interval between the old and the new, while the very act of breaking them produces the chief result aimed at, union, and this union is a Dionysiac form of the *ngia ngiampe* relation. Such union is effected by masters and slaves exchanging positions and attire, by men and women exchanging the garments of their sex, by eating together, by mutual feastings, by exchange of presents and of friendly visits, and the like. All these are methods of union, but they are no less exchanges of identity ; all in fact are acts of the *ngiampe* type. Thus old wounds are healed, old quarrels patched up ; the licence is simply a method of cementing union. New food and drink meanwhile renew man's strength, and

[1] [Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), xi. 291 *n.*[2].]

[2] C. Nyrop, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

food shared with others in feasts, or the flesh and blood of the totem or god sacramentally eaten, cement the union of one with another.

Man's desire for social union and harmony is very keen, and the fact that he has these ceremonial methods of producing it, as those others used to produce harmony and union between individuals, is one which tells strongly in favour of the view that, as man was perhaps not always gregarious, so in early society he had none of the solidarity of clan, tribe or kin, which is often attributed to him. Why these anxious methods of welding together the body politic, if the "tie of blood" was instinctively so strong? Man's individualism, though diffident and shy of responsibility, was in primitive times by no means lost in socialism. Individual diffidence and the "desire for company," as it may be phrased, for the desire for children and of the average sensual man in every age is of the same nature as their primitive brother's desire, may be seen in what Ellis states of the Polynesians. "One of the reasons which they gave why so many slept in a house was their constant apprehension of evil spirits, which were supposed to wander about at night and grasp or strangle the objects of their displeasure, if found alone; great numbers passing the night under the same roof removed this fear and inspired confidence of security."[1] The feeling has given rise to a common practice observed with "sacred" persons whose safety is either threatened or is important to the community. When the King of Boni in Celebes sits, all sit; when he rises, all rise; should he ride and fall from his horse, all must fall from their horses likewise; when he bathes, all the

[1] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches* (1859), i. 341.

courtiers must bathe too.[1] The same custom is used in Fiji, and is known as *bale muri*.[2] In Abyssinia there are four officers called *Lika Mankuas*, who have to clothe themselves exactly like the king, so that the enemy may not be able to distinguish him. A Mr Bell, an Englishman, once held this post.[3] In Uganda, if the king laughs, all the courtiers laugh, if he sneezes, all sneeze, and so on.[4] Similar accounts are given of barbaric kings.[5] Amongst Kaffir tribes the "king has a sort of valets, who appear to wear his cast-off clothes; when he is sick, they are obliged to allow themselves to be wounded, that a portion of their blood may be introduced into the king's circulation, and a portion of his into theirs. They are usually killed at his death."[6] This case leads to those instances of "mock kings" and the like, which are often cases of substitutes and proxies for the real monarch, as well as for the people, whose "pawns" these proxies are. In the Yoruba country, the king's eldest son governs jointly with him. He has to commit suicide when the king dies.[7] In connection with the fear of handselling, it is noteworthy that such persons are used to do acts for the first time, so as to remove the danger. Thus in the Hindoo Koosh, the rajah begins the ploughing and

[1] Sir J. Brooke *and* Sir G. R. Mundy, *Narrative of Events in Borneo and Celebes* (1848), i. 30.

[2] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 39.

[3] J. L. Krapf, *Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours during an Eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa* (1860), p. 454.

[4] R. W. Felkin, "Notes on the Waganda Tribe of Central Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* (1886), xiii. 711.

[5] Athenæus, *Deipnosophists*, 249; Strabo, *Geography*, xvii. 2, 3.

[6] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (1857), p. 117.

[7] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (1894), p. 167.

sowing.[1] The Todas employ the low-caste Curumbas to guide the first plough, sow the first seed, and reap the first sheaf.[2]

Let us now take some miscellaneous illustrations of these principles, occurring in these periodic festivals of renewal and of union, and on other occasions. At the Saturnalia festival of the Mundaris, the masters feast their labourers.[3] There is some idea of securing an infant's safety in the practice, common throughout the Archipelago between Celebes and New Guinea, of giving a feast to a number of village children, when a child is born or receives its name.[4]

Amongst the Dieri and neighbouring tribes on occasions of making peace, covenants and alliances, occasions, of course, which have in common with Saturnalia the intention of union, and also at tribal festivals generally, there is an exchange of wives all round and what is wrongly called promiscuous sexual intercourse.[5] It is a sacred method of union as has been shown.[6] The fact that jealousy is forbidden on these occasions does not prove, as has been asserted, either that the custom is a return to previous communism, or that the Australian has no marital jealousy. If he has none, why forbid it? In the case of forming alliances the exchange is of course a factor in making the union, such contact physically assisting it. The people of Leti, Moa and Lakor hold an annual feast at which free inter-

[1] J. Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh* (1880), p. 106.

[2] H. Harkness, *A Description of a Singular Aboriginal Race inhabiting the Neilgherry Hills* (1832), p. 56.

[3] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (1872), p. 196.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 75.

[5] S. Gason, "The Tribes, Dieyerie, Auminie, Yandrawontha, Yarawuarka, Pilladopa," *J.A.I.* (1895), xxiv. 169, 173.

[6] [Above, i. 254, 296.]

course takes place.[1] [In Mailu an annual feast takes place; the last few days of this feast seem "to be associated with opportunities for short-lived intrigues, and occasionally there even seem to be features of licentiousness, groups absconding together."[2] The Besisi of the Malay Peninsula "commonly have a regular carnival (at the end of the *padi* or rice harvest) when (as they say) they are 'allowed to exchange' their wives. . . ."][3] At the Saturnalia of the Hos "promiscuous" intercourse takes place.[4] [Very similar cases have been observed among more highly developed peoples; thus among certain Hindus, "The festival of Holi marks the arrival of spring, and is held in honour of the goddess Holica, or Vasanti, who personifies that season in the Hindu Pantheon. The carnival lasts several days, during which time the most licentious debauchery and disorder reign throughout every class of society. It is the regular Saturnalia of India. Persons of the greatest respectability, without regard to rank or age, are not ashamed to take part in the orgies which mark this season of the year."][5]

Amongst the Hawaiians "promiscuous" sexual intercourse takes place at the feast after a death.[6] In Mangaia, at the same feast, all exchange presents.[7] The Samoyeds kill a reindeer over the grave,[8] the Arinzes a horse,[9] and

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 373.

[2] B. Malinowski, "The Natives of Mailu," *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Australia* (1915), xxxix. 664.

[3] W. W. Skeat *and* C. O. Blagden, *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula* (1906), ii. 70.

[4] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (1872), p. 196.

[5] L. Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes* (1876), p. 173.

[6] U. Lisiansky, *A Voyage Round the World* (1814), p. 122.

[7] W. W. Gill, *Life in the Southern Isles* [1876], p. 77.

[8] J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie* (1776), p. 16.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

the mourners eat it there. On such occasions there is to be seen the working of these principles ; a desire for union among the survivors and a desire for new strength and life, both prompted by the sad example of the dead person ; the two impulses are satisfied simultaneously by eating together, exchanging gifts and similar acts of union, such as sexual intercourse. Again, as may be seen when the mourners eat the offerings of the dead, there is the further and most natural idea, retained by Catholicism in the feast of All Souls, of effecting union with the departed. This desire for the impossible is a psychological necessity in real mourning, and is well shown by such customs as that of the widows in the Hervey Islands, who will wear the dress of their dead husbands. A widower may be seen walking about in a gown of his departed wife. "Instead of her shawl, a mother will wear on her back a pair of trousers belonging to a little son just laid in his grave."[1] Andamanese widows carry about the skulls of their dead husbands, Red Indian mothers carry a doll, representing a dead child, and Australian women carry about the rotting remains of their dead husbands.[2] In Timorlaut as mourning the widow wears a piece of her dead husband's clothing in her hair ; the reverse is done by widowers.[3] Communion with the dead is most exactly reached, and the identity of eating with a person and eating him, most clearly shown, in the common Australian practice in which mourners drink the humours of the decaying corpse, or eat its flesh. The Kurnai anoint themselves with decomposed matter from the dead.[4]

[1] W. W. Gill, *Life in the Southern Isles* [1876], p. 78.

[2] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880), p. 243.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (1886), p. 307.

[4] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

The same is done in the Kingsmill Islands "to remember him."[1] So in Timorlaut mourners smear themselves with the fluids of the corpse.[2] The Aru islanders drink them "to effect union with the dead man." Some is kept in order to injure enemies (by the contagion of death, we may well suppose).[3] This case resumes in itself all the principles of contact, and shows the fallacy of supposing such practices to be intended to keep "the life in the family." Of course, the idea correlates with the notion of getting a dead man's strength, as we have seen,[4] but the impulse is individual. When Artemisia drank the ashes of Mausolus,[5] it was for love of him, and not to satisfy family pride. Here we once more reach the idea of receiving a man's properties by eating his flesh; and conversely in these mourning customs, there is sometimes to be seen a desire to avoid injury from the departed spirit by inoculating oneself with him, an idea translated by many peoples into a fear that the ghost will be offended if he is not mourned for properly.

Another feature of these festivals is a practice which is very common in all early religious custom, and is a good illustration of that general habit of make-believe which is connected with sympathetic magic on the one hand, and on the other with primitive diffidence in action, and fear of close-quarters, an early stage in the growth of character which is not easily passed. At the Saturnalia of the Hos, sons and daughters revile their parents and their parents revile them.[6] This method of showing the

[1] L. Fison *and* A. W. Howitt, *loc. cit.*

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.*, p. 308. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 267.

[4] [Above, i. 34, 188.]

[5] Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticæ*, x. 18; Valerius Maximus, *De factis dictisque memorabilibus*, iv. 65.

[6] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (1872), p. 196.

reality of the change of life by emphasising the interval between the new and the old may lead up to the feature we are to discuss. In Upper Egypt on the 10th of September of each year, there is a festival at which each town chooses a temporary lord, who is dressed up as a clown.[1] In this, as in the cases of most mock kings which have been collected, there is a double idea. The mock king is a "proxy" for the people, he is their substitute, who bears their calamities away as a scapegoat; and he is reviled and mocked. He represents them, on the principles of substitution and make-believe; he takes away their troubles, on the same principles, and because of the desire for a periodic change of life and of personal identity. Why is he mocked and ill-treated? The actual word "mock," with its double meaning, preserves the answer. *They* deserve the reviling for their sins, but he as their proxy will receive it; it is a convenient method of substitution, of transference of responsibility. Moreover, by a natural confusion, he represents these evils, in particular those which admit of easy personification, such as diseases and the like; as such, he is to be scourged and mocked as they would gladly treat the actual evils. He is thus proxy for two sets of persons.

The war-dance and similar sympathetic processes, which assist the real result by imitating it, show how the above-mentioned idea is connected with sympathetic magic. These practices have a true psychological basis and subjective use; they resemble rehearsals; by previously going through the result, man ensures its successful issue, just as a man runs over in his mind something he is about to do. ["The primary aim of the war-dance seems to be the development of physical

[1] C. B. Klunzinger, *Bilder aus Oberägypten* (1877), p. 180.

excitement, and consequently courage, in the dancing warriors, and, secondarily, as magical ideas attach themselves, the aim of frightening the enemy by a demonstration of violence is added. But, throughout, the practical but unconscious result for the savage regiments is drill and a rehearsal of attack. The latter meaning also takes on the notions of imitative magic. In the same way a modern peasant soldier, rehearsing an attack or practising with the bayonet, may imagine that he is actually fighting the spiritual forms of the enemy or some vague ghostly foe. There can be little doubt that the war-dances of barbarous peoples and even of those of the ancient Spartans were, unconsciously, rehearsals of battle.[1]

"War-dances are also performed for the purpose of combating supernatural influences of any kind. The Arunta of Australia, after returning from an expedition of vengeance, dance an excited war-dance, by way of repelling the ghost of the man whom they have executed.[2] In agricultural ritual the evil influences of blight, bad weather, and general infertility with its various causes are often assailed by a war-dance or similar demonstration. Thus, in ancient Italy 'the dancing priests of the god [Mars] derived their name of Salii from the leaps or dances which they were bound to execute as a solemn religious ceremony every year in the Conitium. . . . Similar colleges of dancing priests are known to have existed in many towns of ancient Italy.'[3] But their dancing was a war-dance with curious weapons, more potent, doubtless, for expelling demons of infertility[4]

[1] On war-dances see F. de Ménil, *Histoire de la danse à travers les ages* [1905], pp. 217-235.

[2] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 493 *et seq.*

[3] Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911-1915), ix. 232.

[4] *Ibid.*, ix. 234.

than their high leaps were for making the corn grow high. The natives of French Guinea prepare the fields for sowing thus: 'Fifty or sixty blacks in a line, with bent backs, are smiting the earth simultaneously with their little iron tools, which gleam in the sun. Ten paces in front of them, marching backwards, the women sing a well-marked air, clapping their hands as for a dance, and the hoes keep time to the song. Between the workers and the singers a man runs and dances, crouching on his hams like a clown, while he whirls about his musket and performs other manœuvres with it. Two others dance, also pirouetting and smiting the earth here and there with their little hoe. All that is necessary for exorcising the spirits and causing the grain to sprout.'[1] A remarkable Greek parallel to this is the agricultural ceremony of the ancient Magnetes and Aenianians termed καρπαία. Men ploughed and sowed, but acted as on the alert against robbers. The drama ended in a conflict and the repulse of the enemy.[2]

"The notion that dancing, by reason of its vigorous movement can induce movement in the environment is illustrated by curious customs employed for rain-making. In Morocco ball-games of the hockey type are played for this purpose; the rapid movements of the ball and of the players are supposed to induce movements in the clouds.[3] Another case of ceremonial movement (which is of the essence of magical dancing) is that of the rain-maker of the Australian Arunta. To produce a shower of rain, he goes through a curious process of quivering

[1] O. de Sanderval, *De l'Atlantique au Niger par le Foutah-Djallon* (1883), p. 230.

[2] Sir W. Smith *and* G. E. Marindin "Saltatio," *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* (1891), ii. 593.

[3] E. Westermarck, *Ceremonies and Beliefs connected with Agriculture, certain Dates of the Solar Year, and the Weather, in Morocco* (1913), pp. 121 *et seq.*

in his body and legs, while his assistants chant in time with his movements. At day-break he makes a final and exhausting effort.[1]

It has been suggested that the crane-dance (γέρανος) of Greek mythology records a magical dance for assisting the progress of the sun. This case is complicated. 'When Theseus landed with Ariadne in Delos on his return from Crete, he and the young companions whom he had rescued from the Minotaur are said to have danced a mazy dance in imitation of the intricate windings of the Labyrinth; on account of its sinuous turns the dance was called "the Crane."'[2] In various parts of the world pantomimic dances have imitated the flight of birds. This may be the case here. A similar dance was practised by the Romans, as 'the Game of Troy.' The maze-scheme for dancing evolutions, however, is quite common, and would easily attach itself to famous names and exploits. Sir James Frazer suggests that the intention of both was to imitate, and so to assist, the sun's progress through the sky.[3]

"The data are insufficient to analyse such cases as that of the King of Onitsha, on the Niger, who danced annually before his people, possibly to show his physical fitness.[4] But, certainly, throughout what may be called the positive applications of dancing, personal vigour is demonstrated and invites attention. In many customs it may be said both to compel attention and to invite imitation.

[1] Sir W. B. Spencer *and* F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), pp. 189 *et seq.*

[2] Sir J. G. Frazer, *op. cit.*, iv. 75, *citing* Plutarch, *Theseus*, 21; J. Pollux, *Onomasticon* (1706), iv. 101.

[3] Sir J. G. Frazer, *op. cit.*, iv. 75 *et seq.*

[4] S. Crowther *and* J. C. Taylor, *The Gospel on the Banks of the Niger* (1859-1864), i. 433.

"Some applications of the dance are 'sympathetic' in the natural sense, without being necessarily magical. Thus, it is recorded of old Madagascar that, 'while the men are at the wars, and until their return, the women and girls cease not day and night to dance. . . . They believe that by dancing they impart strength, courage and good fortune to their husbands. . . .'[1] So Yuki women danced continuously that their men might not be weary.[2] These very natural practices, such as children would instinctively develop, are not primarily magical. On the Gold Coast, when a battle is expected, the women at home have a kind of sham fight, in which they cut to pieces green gourds, as if they were the enemy.[3] The wives of soldiers, in all ages, have shown a fundamental desire to be fighting by the side of their husbands.

"Dancing very frequently accompanies the funeral, and no less frequently is performed at or round the death-bed. These customs are still found to-day among the peasantry of Spain, France and Ireland, as well as among such natives as those of the East Indian islands and of North and South America.[4] Various beliefs attach to this application of the dance. The Gauchos dance to celebrate the dead person's entrance into heaven.[5] In 1879 the congregation of a coloured church in Arkansas danced for three nights round the grave of their dead pastor, trying to bring him back to life.[6]

[1] E. de Flacourt, *Histoire de la grande isle Madagascar* (1658), pp. 97-98.

[2] S. Powers, *Tribes of California* (1877), pp. 129-130.

[3] Sir A. B. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking of the Gold Coast of West Africa* (1887), p. 226.

[4] L. Grove [Lady Frazer], *Dancing* (1895), *see* Index, *s.v.* "Funeral dances."

[5] R. B. Cunninghame Graham, "Un Angelito," *The Saturday Review: Christmas Supplement* (1896), p. 17.

[6] *Boston Herald*, 7th of May, 1887, quoted in *The Journal of American Folk-Lore* (1888), i. 83.

"Dancing as a form or part of religious worship is a natural phenomenon, whatever may be the precise meaning or application of the particular occasion. In early Christianity bishops led the faithful in the sacred dances both in the churches and before the tombs of the martyrs. The practice was forbidden by the Council of 692, but the prohibition was ineffective. Centuries later the Liturgy of Paris includes the rubric, 'le chanoine ballera au premier psaume.' As late as the 18th century dancing by the priests on saints' days was practised in French provinces.[1]

"The various ideas connected with dancing will be found latent in the religious dance. When David danced before the Ark, the act no doubt meant something more than the desire to honour the sacred object. In some cases where the intention is certainly to 'move' the deity, the vigorous movements of the dancer makes the dance a real form of prayer. The following example is suggestive: the Tarahumare Indians of Mexico, hold that 'the favour of the gods may be won by what for want of a better word may be called dancing, a kind of rhythmical exercise, kept up sometimes for two nights. By dint of such hard work they think to prevail upon the gods to grant their prayers. . . . The Tarahumares assert that the dances have been taught them by the animals. . . . Dance with these people is a very serious and ceremonial matter, a kind of worship and incantation rather than amusement.'[2] The honorific element also pervades many dancing customs."][3]

Further, in some cases these dances, fights, contests

[1] L. Grove, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-97.

[2] C. Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico* (1903), i. 330-331.

[3] A. E. Crawley, "Processions and Dances," *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (1918), x. 359-360, 361.

and riotings are intended to drive away actual evil influences, in others the potentiality of evil is driven away, before it can become actualised: and this is naturally done on occasions when excessive joy by psychological law induces a fear of vague imminent danger, as seen in the idea of Nemesis. The practice is also followed to avenge some wrong, fancied or real, with a half serious, half make-believe feeling. Thus, in New Britain, when a boy and girl who are betrothed, are grown up, and part of the "price" has been paid, he builds a little house in the bush, and elopes with his bride. Her father sallies out with friends, apparently in anger, to kill the groom. They do not really wish to find him, but they burn the house. On their return they find the pair installed in their home.[1] Amongst the same people, when a widower marries, the female relatives of the dead wife assemble near his place. It is a day of liberty and fun for them. They take their husbands' or brothers' weapons, or any article of male attire they can find, and have the liberty of daubing with red paint any man they can catch. If a woman approaches a man he moves off. At a given signal they throw themselves on the man's house, fences and other property, and destroy as far as they can. The owner has no power to interfere. The custom is called *Varagut*, and the only explanation which they give is that "the women are angry on account of the first wife, they do not care to see the labour of the first wife go to benefit the second." Similarly at Fijian funerals, the women whip the men with long whips, and the men flip clay bullets at the women.[2]

[1] H. H. Romilly, *The Western Pacific and New Guinea* (1887), p. 27.

[2] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838-42* (1845), iii. 99.

On the other side, savage make-believe is connected with diffidence, and with an interesting notion that the "intention" is everything. Amongst the Maoris a blow given by proxy is regarded as if it actually were dealt to the person intended, and is spoken of as such. A man, for instance, struck the ground close to his enemy, who was lying ill; Mr Shortland, on hearing an account of this, was given to understand that the sick man had actually been thrashed.[1] A mourner in the Andaman Islands will shoot arrows into the jungle, evil spirits who cause death being supposed to dwell there; he also will pierce the ground with a spear all round the dead man, "hoping to inflict a mortal wound on an unseen enemy."[2] In Maori warfare, a part of the stockade is called after a hostile chief, and then fired at by the garrison. One often hears a chief complain that he has been shot at, when it was only his effigy.[3] South Australians, when about to attack Europeans, beat their weapons together, threw dust in the air, spat, and so on, and made gestures of defiance.[4] All this kind of thing is well seen in the habits of children and of animals, and is due to fear of direct action. Now, in some of these annual festivals and on other occasions there are mock contests, which are explained by these ideas. We saw[5] how parents and children reviled each other at their Saturnalia; the same principle is behind the football match played at the annual festival in Shoa, first between men, and then between women. The

[1] E. Shortland, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand* (1851), pp. 21-22.

[2] E. H. Man, "The Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands," *J.A.I.* (1883), xii. 146.

[3] E. Shortland, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27.

[4] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (1845), ii. 225.

[5] [Above, i. 344-345.]

victorious side abuses the defeated, and riot and debauchery end the day.[1] After a successful fishing expedition, Fijian women were seen to meet the returning men with dancing and songs, and with a smart volley of bitter oranges ; this the men returned by driving the women from the beach.[2] This simple case of delight expressed in recrimination is no custom, but a psychological result, quite common in human nature, which, however, is instructive here as illustrating the origin of customs which resemble it.

The same method is also used in primitive etiquette, which is based on fear and the taboo of personal isolation. When Krapf arrived at a Pemba village, the king was very friendly, but ordered his musketeers to fire a volley, "to expel evil spirits."[3] In Tonga presents are made to a new arrival, visitor or native who has been away, but there is a curious proviso. The new-comers can be challenged by any one, and a sort of sham fight must take place. The visitors always get a thorough beating, but it is all done in a friendly way.[4] Mr New was always received in the African villages he reached, with war-dances.[5] The Indians of the Yukon, on meeting Mr Dall, advanced on him firing blank cartridge.[6] So amongst the Maoris mock fights were performed at all visits, reeds and rail-fencing being used instead of weapons.[7] In savage as in other etiquette

[1] Sir W. C. Harris, *The Highlands of Æthiopia* (1844), iii. 198.

[2] T. Williams *and* J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (1870), i. 92.

[3] J. L. Krapf, *Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours during an Eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa* (1860), p. 269.

[4] W. Mariner, *An Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands* (1817), i. 346.

[5] C. New, *Life, Wanderings, etc., in Eastern Africa* (1874), pp. 80, 301.

[6] W. H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources* (1870), p. 93.

[7] J. S. Polack, *Manners and Customs of the New Zealanders* (1840), i. 86-87, ii. 170.

indirectness is universal. In East Africa, a mistake in etiquette towards the chief is severely punished, and amongst the Wagande, the offender will be slain on the spot. A man will hardly address another directly as "you," nor will he use a direct negative if he can avoid it. The expressions are "the master knows," etc., and for a negative, "I will see if that happens."[1] The make-believe method is often used in punishment. Amongst Australians and Tasmanians, the offender against the customs was required to stand while spears were thrown at him, which he avoided as best he could by contortions of the body.[2] In the Milya-uppa tribe, when a man had given another some cause of complaint, custom required that he should allow his head to be struck by the individual offended, till blood came.[3]

In many of the above-mentioned customs there is clearly brought out the subconscious feeling, so characteristic of the religious relations of man with man in primitive culture, that it is human persons who cause trouble and evil, human agencies that are to be punished or propitiated. In others the fiction of primitive promiscuity is exposed; others, again, illustrate the primitive conception of relationship.

[1] J. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *J.A.I.* (1893), xxii. 119.

[2] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (1886-1887), iii. 596.

[3] *Ibid.*, ii. 179.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, ABERDEEN

Readers

New Britain - largest island of Bismarck S. Pacific Archipelago - now under Australian mandate 10,000 sq miles & 52,000 population.

New Caledonia - island in South Pacific, French penal colony - cap. Noumea, 7,654 sq miles population 50,600.

New Granada - Colombia (CA)

New Guinea - isl of Malayan archipelago 311,023 sq miles & 1,000,000 population 1919 Australian mandate since 1914 war (Great Britain & Holland formerly & Germany had divided it among them)
Location north of Australia.

New Hebrides group of islands in S. Pacific, north of New Caledonia & W Fiji Islands 5110 sq miles & 70,000 population.

New Ireland - Island in S. Pacific formerly belonged to Bismarck Archipelago German ownership yielded to Australian mandate 1914: Population 28,500 capital Kaewieng

Guiana - N E. South America

CALUMET COLLEGE OF ...
GN480 .C8 1927 STACKS
Crawley, Alfred Ern/The mystic rose; a s
3 0933 00065 8951

Confession 327

111 sacrifice
gods eat essence of food
274 sacrifice

GN
480
.C8
1927
vol.1

The Mystic Rose